Index to Minutes of Meeting
The Commission of Fine Arts
17 November 1953

Anacostia Bridge
Compliance with CFA Recommendations
See Exhibit A page 5
Art Government
Advisory Committee on 8

Bolivar, Statue of Simon
Time limitation on completion 3
Bridge at E Street, Northwest
Opposition to
See Exhibit A page 1

Carillon, The Netherlands
Site for
See Exhibit A page 8
Commission of Fine Arts
Sixteenth Report of 1

Delano, Memorial to Frederic A.
Discussion of form of memorial 10

Freer Gallery of Art
Acquisitions by purchase 11

General Accounting Office
Mural painting inspected 1
Great Plaza
Progress report on eliminating parking
See Exhibit A page 18

Highway through Rock Creek Park
Opposition to
See Exhibit A page 6

Jackson, Andrew
Statue of for Hickory, North Carolina 9
Japanese Lantern
Site for
See Exhibit A page 22

Legislation- Report on
HR 5397/83rd C to provide for
establishment of War Memorial Art Commn. 8

Marine Corps War Memorial
Site for
See Exhibit A page 9;17

Nevius Tract as part of
Arlington Cemetery
See Exhibit A page 16

Old Patent Office Building
Discussion of bill to demolish
building and use lot for parking
See Exhibit A page 19

Postage Stamp DesignCompetition 11
Public Law 808-Old Georgetown Act
Submission #747 for razing residences at
3614-16-18-20 O Street, N.W. 2
Public Schools
Junior High in Mahon Park 5

Rose Garden in West Potomac Park
Development of
See Exhibit A page 20

Shipstead-Luce Act
Submission #1600 - erection of apart-
ment house at Conn. Avenue and Calvert St. 2
Liquor store adjacent to Washington Hotel
facing Pennsylvania Avenue 2

Theodore Roosevelt Island
Impairment by construction of bridge
See Exhibit A page 1

War Memorial Arts Commission
HR 5397/83rd C - to establish 8

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Held in Washington, D. C., November 17, 1953

The third meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, during the fiscal year 1954, was held in its Office in the Interior Department Building on Tuesday, November 17, 1953. The following members were present.

Mr. Finley, Chairman,
Mr. Neild,
Prof. Belluschi,
Mr. Peets,
Mr. Biddle,
Mr. de Weldon,
also H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on October 22, 1953, were approved.

2. SIXTEENTH REPORT OF THE COMMISSION: The Secretary presented the draft of the Sixteenth Report of the Commission of Fine Arts covering the period from July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1954. It will be reviewed by the Chairman during the next two months; thereupon it will be mimeographed so that the other members of the Commission can also review it. It is to be ready for presentation to the President by about June 1, 1954, so that he can forward it to the Congress for printing, with illustrations, during that month. The Report will largely cover the work of the present members of the Commission during the past four years.

The Secretary stated that there is constant demand for copies of the Reports of the Commission, but copies of only the more recent ones are still available.

3. PAINTING, GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE: Chairman Finley reported that yesterday he talked with Mr. David Persina, Chief of Design of the Public

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Held in Washington, D. C., November 17, 1953

The third meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, during the fiscal year 1954, was held in its Office in the Interior Department Building on Tuesday, November 17, 1953. The following members were present:

Mr. Finley, Chairman,
Mr. Nolen,
Prof. Bellucchi,
Mr. Peets,
Mr. Biddle,
Mr. de Weldon,
Glen H. P. Taemmerer, Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The minutes of the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on October 20, 1953, were approved.

2. SIXTEENTH REPORT OF THE COMMISSION: The Secretary presented the draft of the Sixteenth Report of the Commission of Fine Arts covering the period from July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1954. It will be reviewed by the Chairman during the next two months; thereupon it will be mimeographed so that the other members of the Commission can also review it. It is to be ready for presentation to the President by about June 1, 1954, so that he can forward it to the Congress for printing, with illustrations, during that month. The Report will largely cover the work of the present members of the Commission during the past four years.

The Secretary stated that there is considerable demand for copies of the Reports of the Commission, but copies of only the more recent ones are still available.

3. PAINTING, CENTRAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE: Chairman Finley reported that yesterday he talked with Mr. David Pereira, Chief of Design of the Public

Buildings Office, who told him that one of the mural paintings in the Office of the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, has been completed, and that it ought to be inspected by the Commission.

The Commission decided to inspect the painting during the December meeting.

4. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSION: The Secretary presented a set of plans received from the Building Inspector (Application No. 1600) for the erection of an apartment in Square 2205, at Connecticut Avenue and Calvert Street, Northwest, along Woodley Drive.

Mr. Neild and Mr. Belluschi inspected the drawings, and upon their recommendations, the Commission approved the design. The Building Inspector was notified accordingly.

5. LIQUOR STORE BUILDING: The Secretary presented a design for a Liquor Store Building, to be built adjacent to the Washington Hotel, facing Pennsylvania Avenue. Mr. Neild and Mr. Belluschi inspected the design and they recommended that the architect be requested to submit a revised design. Thereupon, Mr. Wells, the architect, appeared before the Commission to discuss the drawing.

Mr. Neild said, "It is my suggestion that the facing material of the building be of one material, and that the pattern which has been indicated in subdividing the limestone blocks be made larger, more in scale with the building. It is a small building but it is in an important location."

Mr. Wells said he proposed using painted cinder block at the side of the building. To this both Mr. Neild and Mr. Belluschi objected; Mr. Neild said, "My requirement would be that the same material used here at the front, using a larger pattern for subdivision of the stone, and the same material at the side." The Commission concurred, and a revised design will be submitted.

4. "OLD GEORGETOWN CASE:" The Secretary submitted application O. G. No. 747, for razing residences at 3614-16-18-20 "O" Street, Northwest, in "Old

Georgetown," stating:

> "Our Advisory Committee on Old Georgetown has come to a real problem in connection with these buildings. They are owned by Georgetown University, which wants to raze them because of substandard conditions in the rear yards, and perhaps in their interiors; but the exteriors are not so bad. They were built about 1880. The tenants do not take care of the buildings properly and they are a nuisance, since they disturb students in class-rooms nearby."

Chairman Finley said that "It is a very shabby neighborhood and everyone in Georgetown was hoping that something would be done about it by the University." He asked to what use the University authorities want to put the ground. Since no information was available on that point, the Commission suggested that inquiry be made on the subject. Chairman Finley said he would arrange to have a talk with the President of the University or Father Walsh about the matter.

5. STATUE OF SIMON BOLIVAR: Chairman Finley quoted from a Memorandum that he had received from the Secretary concerning this project, stating:

> "You will note from copy of Public Law 157, 81st Congress, pertaining to the Simon Bolivar statue that the five years allowed the foundation to begin erection of the statue expires July 5, 1954. On May 22, 1951, we wrote to the president of the Simon Bolivar Memorial Foundation that we approved the erection of the statue, the Commission having inspected the model at the studio of the sculptor, Mr. de Weldon, and we were well pleased with it. The Commission recommended that an architect be employed to design the pedestal, which design should be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts. As for a location, the Commission approved the triangle at 18th and G Streets, Northwest, in front of this, the Interior Department Building."

Mr. de Weldon was asked for any comments, and he said, "I have the statue nearly completed in plaster in the full size and if we cannot start with the erection before that date, I think an amendment to the Act will be introduced to extend the time for another five years."

Chairman Finley asked, "Does the Bolivar Memorial Foundation have the funds and are they prepared to go through with it?" Mr. de Weldon replied, "Yes."

"Then," Chairman Finley said, "I should think all that would be necessary

would be to begin the erection of the statue, by preparing the site and beginning work on the pedestal, even though the casting of the bronze equestrian statue may not be completed at this time."

Mr. de Weldon said, "The bronze casting will not be completed by that time." Whereupon Chairman Finley asked, "Would it not be necessary then to initiate proceedings to take advantage of the site before next year?"

Mr. de Weldon replied, "Yes."

Thereupon, Chairman Finley asked Mr. de Weldon to watch this legislation, and he replied that he would do so.

6. SUBMISSIONS BY THE OFFICE OF NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE: Mr. Harry T. Thompson, Associate Director of the Office of National Capital Parks, National Park Service, presented for discussion with the Commission of Fine Arts, the following projects with which his office is concerned. The page numbers refer to the pages in Exhibit A:

(a) E Street Bridge, and Theodore Roosevelt Island. Page 1

(b) Anacostia Bridge, Page 5

(c) Highway through Rock Creek Park--Route 240. Page 6

(d) Dutch Carillon. Pages 8 and 9

(e) Marine Corps War Memorial site. Page 9
Nevius Tract as part of Arlington National Cemetery. Page 16

(f) Great Plaza, opposite Department of Commerce. Page 18

(g) Old Patent Office Building; Page 19

(h) Rose Garden. Page 20

(i) Japanese Lantern. Page 22

The Commission commented on these projects, as set forth in the Discussion (pages as above indicated) which is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes. (Exhibit A)

part of these Minutes. (Exhibit A)

The Commission commenced on these applications, the set forth in the pro-
cession (pages as above indicated) [illegible]

(f) Great Plains, applied [illegible]

(g) Old Federal Office Building; Page 12

(h) Rose Garden. Page 10

(i) Japanese Lantern. Page 10

(b) Anacostia Bridge, Page 5

(c) Highway through rock creek [illegible]

(d) Burton Carillon. Pages 6 and 9

(e) Marine Corps War Memorial Site. Page 7

Merlin Trees as part of Extension Mall [illegible]

(a) E Street Bridge, and Theodore Roosevelt Island. Pages

is concerned. The page numbers refer to the pages in Exhibit A

the Commission of Fine Arts, for Submitting Payment [illegible]

tional Capital Parks, National Park Service, requested for discussion with

SERVICE: Mr. Henry I. Thompson, Associate Director of the Office of Na-

5. SUBMISSIONS BY THE OFFICE OF [illegible] PARTNER PARKS, NATIONAL PARK

tion, and he replied that he would do so.

Thereupon, Chairman Finley asked Mr. [illegible] to speak then Ledyte-

to initiate proceedings to take advantage of the site before next year."

Mr. de Weldon replied, "Yes."

time." Whereupon Sherman Kirk inquired, "Would it not be necessary [illegible]

equestrian statue may not be completed at this time."

Mr. de Weldon said, "The bronze casting will not be completed by this

beginning work on the pedestal, even though the casting of the bronze

would be the keeping the granite of the casing of [illegible] the site for

7. DESIGN FOR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL: Mr. Merrel A. Coe, Municipal Architect, submitted a design for a Junior High School to be built at Mahon Park. He said:

> "We made quite a number of studies for a Junior High School in a very restricted site. The elevation of the street is 56; the natural grade at the corner of the property is 90. It is quite a grade differential. So we have handled that by stepping the buildings up the hill and terracing. Part of the ground would be for playground space. There would be short retaining walls. The recommendation of the Planning and Coordinating Committee for the public schools is to buy this piece of property, and we are hoping they will do that. At the present time, they are only obligated to buy to this line (indicating). This is zoned for First Commercial and we on the committee were afraid that there would be some business going on that would be detrimental to the school. If we had that ground it would give us a little better area around the building."

Mr. Neild asked, "Mr. Coe, is it necessary to congest a site that much?"

Mr. Coe replied:

> "We had quite an argument on this. We originally planned to put the school along here (indicating) and we were coming back and take a 90-foot strip off this. It is just a part of Fort Mahon Park that has not been developed. We were taking a slice across here (indicating), and we were putting a long school similar to our Douglas School plan with the school here (indicating) and the gym at the end. This was pretty good property and Mrs. Phillips, one of the school board members, objected very strenuously to buying property and taking property off the tax rolls. It was only about $50,000 difference in the actual cost of this site and this (indicating). These houses are rather old and not very good; it would be nice to get rid of them. So we were instructed to try to work out a school for this site; and after quite a number of schemes, we figured out that this would be the best way to develop it."

Professor Belluschi asked, "How much acreage for playground, then?"

Mr. Coe replied, "This is about 620 by 300 feet. The playground area will be fairly adequate for a junior high school. This will also be used by the Recreation Department as a unit in their recreation plan, with facilities. It is a three-story building with four stories in the center for 1500 pupils."

Professor Belluschi asked, "Are other sites available?"

Mr. Coe replied, "No. We have been working on this particular junior high school for a number of years. There were sites a little farther out. They

were close to the District Line, but before the District Government could buy them, developers went in and built up the whole area."

Commenting on the design, Professor Belluschi said:

> "It is a nice building, but in groups it creates a certain amount of unrest. You use one scale and then come around and do something else; the fenestration could be improved. I suppose it would not do any good to put on the record the fact that we disapprove the concentration for the new school, that it is counter to all the new standards of school design. The design itself is acceptable, but the general site planning and the concentration should certainly not be acceptable. The courts in the location indicated are objectionable, and the grouping should be rearranged so that the gym would come here (indicating)."

Mr. Neild asked, "Is it necessary that these two buildings be separated?"

Mr. Coe replied, "We like to get our shop units all together. In this wing is entirely what we consider shops, and we have on the next floor laboratories and on the floor above our home economics."

Mr. Peets said, "As you know too well, the building lacks space, organization, and expression." To which Professor Belluschi added, "This is an early stage, so that some comments of that kind should not embarrass you, Mr. Coe, if we said that this is not an acceptable site plan."

Mr. Coe replied, "I don't know that it would embarrass me, but with the studies that we made on it, I feel satisfied we have done about all we can. We here in Washington are handicapped on most of our school projects because of limitation of site and of the type of ground that is left that is not improved, and even that costs a lot. As for this project, we should have more land.

"If we could get this property (indicating), what we were hoping we might do would be to pull the whole thing over and free this along this side (indicating). That was our hope. But I don't believe that we are going to get this property. Condemnation proceedings are going ahead for taking this much (indicating) and I don't believe they will be willing to acquire any more.

The recommendation originally was for them to buy this whole tract and it would have helped tremendously."

Professor Belluschi said, "It is very unfortunate that the school is forced by the very site condition to go back to a worse kind of institutional complex of structures, and that here in the Capital of the United States. My recommendation is that the Commission could not approve this project unless some land was acquired to make it open up; make it possible to have less concentration of buildings. We feel that this is a very important step to be taken, and perhaps it may have a great deal of influence on some other things that may happen later. I cannot see why there should be such stinginess on the part of the Board of Education to refuse to buy any more land than is absolutely essential to plant a lot of buildings there. There they are making a very unsatisfactory complex of buildings for the high school. I would suggest that we disapprove this project as proposed here today and simply say that we will reconsider it if more land is acquired. It is unjust to group buildings for a high school that youngsters have to get accustomed to, where there is a constant feeling of lack of space; it is unsuitable for civilized living and should not be approved. I offer that as a motion."

Mr. Coe said, "Pardon me just one moment. You are disapproving this on the site limitation, not on the solution?"

Professor Belluschi replied, "The solution of the problem, all things taken into consideration, as presented, is the best solution you can do, but it is not good enough. It seems that there should be more land so that you could put the same facilities in a much more attractive way."

Mr. Peets stressed the point that the Resolution state that the site is inadequate and does not permit an acceptable design. Mr. Neild seconded this. A report was sent to Mr. Coe accordingly (Exhibit B).

8. H. R. 5397: Chairman Finley reported that during the past month, he gave particular thought to the question of a reply to the Committee on Education and Labor, of the House of Representatives, concerning H. R. 5397, "To provide for the establishment of a National War Memorial Arts Commission, and for other purposes," which he read as follows (Exhibit C).

Commenting on the letter, Mr. Biddle said, "I think the bill is hideously dangerous, as the Memorandum that I prepared explains. If you think there is any danger that this bill would pass, I would like in some way to get to their attention why I feel that it is a very dangerous bill. That Memorandum is perhaps not for publication. But the reasons I gave in my article that appeared in Art Digest were along more philosophic lines--the danger of incorporating so much power and power of censorship in a highly centralized and bureaucratic organization, is something to be feared."

The Commission discussed this matter, and it was agreed that if and when this bill comes up for Hearing, it would be better if Mr. Biddle would express his views on this matter in oral testimony.

Thereupon, the Commission approved the letter as read by the Chairman, who signed it. In accordance with requirements the letter is being sent to the Bureau of the Budget for clearnace, since the Bill involves an expenditure by the Government.

9. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ART AND GOVERNMENT: Chairman Finley reported to the Commission that in recent months Mr. Lloyd Goodrich, of New York, has been in correspondence with him on the question of the advisory panel that had been appointed during the spring and summer of 1951 by the Chairman, with approval of the Commission of Fine Arts, to assist the Commission in matters relating to the Report on Art and Government; that Mr. Goodrich seemed to be of the opinion that the advisory panel constituted only members of his Committee on Government and Art, whereas such persons as Wheeler Williams,

President, and Arthur F. Brinckerhoff, Vice President, of the National Sculpture Society, who are not members of Goodrich's committee, are distinctly members of the Advisory Panel, as well as Miss Hendricks.

Chairman Finley stated that he hoped this cleared the confused view that Mr. Goodrich seems to have had in this matter. Mr. Finley read from copies of letters received from (Exhibit D), and sent to Mr. Goodrich regarding this matter (Exhibit D-1).

10. STATUE OF ANDREW JACKSON, HICKORY, NORTH CAROLINA: Chairman Finley read the following letter received from Mr. Soutar:

116 Fifth Street, S. W.,
Hickory, North Carolina,

November 5, 1953.

"Dear Mr. Finley:

We thank you for your letter of October 29. I am sure that a replica at the price quoted in your letter would not be feasible at this time. The equestrian statue would be most impressive, but so would a standing figure of General Jackson in bronze be very attractive. The standing figures are always made larger than life-size to give the appearance of life size from a distance, are they not?

Our first preference would be to locate a statue of Andrew Jackson, equestrian or standing figure, in some collection, that for some reason was up for sale. We realize there are very few reasons why a city would want to part with such a treasure. We are hoping that you might have avenues through which you could publicize the demand so that favorable contacts could be made.

If that is utterly impossible, we then would be interested to learn more about how to secure a well-known sculptor to execute a standing figure of the General in bronze. If it is possible to arrange, we realize that to commission an original work of art would be more desirable than having a replica made and would bring greater prestige to our city.

Would a sculptor submit a drawing, dimensions, cost, and other particulars for consideration?

We appreciate the interest you have shown in helping us to secure a statue.

Sincerely yours,
Lane Soutar"

Mr. Biddle suggested that help be secured from the Samuels Memorial Fund, of Philadelphia, by writing to them. They provide monuments for Fairmont Park, but have had a great deal of experience and could supply information as to how to secure this statue for Hickory, North Carolina; Sturgis Ingersoll is a member is a member and possibly Chairman.

Mr. de Weldon suggested the following:

> "I would suggest that the people in Hickory first establish a fund sufficient for the erection of the statue, which would be larger than life-size, and then have a competition among Southern sculptors. Recently I received quite a number of letters from Southern sculptors complaining that they are never considered in any of the competitions or commissions; that all commissions go to sculptors in New York. I think that would give a good opportunity to the sculptors of the South to do some work."

Chairman Finley said that upon writing to Mr. Ingersoll, he would ask him to take that point into consideration and give the names of any Southern sculptors.

Mr. Biddle heartily endorsed the suggestion of Mr. de Weldon, saying, "The Samuel Memorial people could give excellent advice on how to carry out that kind of a competition, and artists' contracts, etc., such as costs."

A letter was sent to Mr. Soutar (Exhibit E).

11. MEMORIAL TO FREDERIC A. DELANO: Chairman Finley reported that a few days ago, Horace Peaslee talked with him about a suggested memorial to Frederic A. Delano, who was a nationally known civic leader, helped organize the National Capital Park and Planning Commission (now the National Capital Planning Commission), and the Committee of One Hundred of the American Planning and Civic Association, serving also as Chairman of both organizations for several years. Mr. Peaslee simply presented his idea and wanted to know how this Commission would react to it.

Mr. Peaslee's idea was that there should be carried out one of Mr. Delano's pet projects in his lifetime, which was to have a putting green in the form of

a map of the United States. Brief articles on this have appeared in the September and October Journals of the American Institute of Architects. Mr. Delano made such a map in the form of a putting green on his own estate on the Hudson, at Newburg. Horace Peaslee's idea was that they should do the same thing here on a larger scale, perhaps in Potomac Park. It is quite a sizeable thing.

Mr. Peets felt that there are two parts to the project. "One thing is the map and the other is the putting green. I don't see any reason why they should be brought together. I think it would be very silly to introduce a putting green as a memorial to a great planner. A map of the United States carried out in the form of a mosaic could be made of real interest to school children."

The Commission thereupon decided that Chairman Finley suggest to Mr. Peaslee that there is not enough information at hand about the project at the present time, and that when it comes up through official channels, the Commission would express an opinion in this matter.

12. FREER GALLERY OF ART: The Commission visited the Freer Gallery of Art where Director Wenley presented for advice a number of works of Far Eastern Art. These were inspected with much interest, and the Commission approved them (Exhibit F).

13. NEW POSTAGE STAMPS: In accordance with arrangements made by the Secretary with Mr. Robertson, the Assistant Postmaster General, and with Mr. Alvin Hall, Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, the Commission met in the Office of Mr. Hall for consideration of the subject of a Program of Competition for new postage stamps. Dr. Hudnut, who was unavoidably prevented from being present, furnished the draft of a Program of Competition for the meeting. (Exhibit G).

Mr. Fellers, Chief of the Philatelic Division of the Post Office

Department, and also Mr. McLeod and Mr. Christensen, Assistants to Mr. Hall in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, took part in the discussion.

Chairman Finley opened the discussion by saying, "We are delighted that you have shown such interest in the plan that Mr. Robertson told us about of having a new series of stamps and holding a competition at least for the first one. The Commission is glad to be of any help that we can in working out the plan and organizing the competition, if one is to be held."

Mr. Robertson replied, "That idea appeals to us."

Mr. Hall said, "We look at this project, as I explained to Mr. Caemmerer over the telephone, as a Post Office project. We are only a contractor for the Post Office Department and we try to give the Department what it wants... We want to cooperate in every way to meet whatever requests come to us from the Department, and I am sure Mr. Robertson is anxious to meet the wishes of the public as well."

A detailed discussion followed, during which Chairman Finley read the draft of the Program of Competition that Dr. Hudnut had prepared. The discussion resolved itself into the following conclusions---

1. That subject matter for stamps could be in the categories of leading Americans; national scenery; abstract subjects of national interest;

2. That color in stamps could include one in addition to white and black;

3. That a competition should be arranged for six new stamps, instead of only one, with six $1,000 prizes;

4. That Mr. Fiske Kimball, Director of the Philadelphia Museum of Art, should be chosen as the "Director" of the Competition under authority of the Postmaster General;

5. The Commission of Fine Arts would serve in an advisory capacity, including selection of the jury;

6. The Bureau of Engraving and Printing would produce the stamps.

In the matter of financing the competition, Mr. Hall said his Office could pay six winners $1,000 each for six different designs. But he would not be permitted to pay anything to anyone who would submit a design on a voluntary basis; in other words, the acceptance of a design is made on a contractual basis. He said also the General Accounting Office and possibly also the Bureau of the Budget would probably have to approve the arrangement. This phase of the matter, Mr. Hall said, would be made the subject of special inquiry by his office during the next few weeks, as well as other details in connection with the proposed program. "The law requires competitive bidding."

Professor Belluschi suggested that the Rockefeller Foundation should be contacted in the matter of securing an allotment from them for this proposed competition.

It was finally agreed that Mr. Robertson would write a letter to the Commission of Fine Arts, authorizing the preparation of the Program of Competition, the appointment of a Director and Jury, and stating that money would be needed in addition to Government funds.

A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit G-1; see also G-2).

14. NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: The Commission decided to hold the next meeting in Washington on Thursday, December 17, 1953.

The Commission adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

DISCUSSION WITH MR. HARRY T. THOMPSON
OF NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS

(a) E STREET BRIDGE AND THEODORE ROOSEVELT ISLAND

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Good morning, Mr. Thompson. I understand you have a number of important things to discuss and only thirty minutes in which to dispose of them.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Caemmerer asked me if I would not come up and let you know what we were thinking about on a number of things. We made a list of three or four items, I think, that he wanted a report on.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We were just discussing before you came in this matter of the bridge.

MR. THOMPSON: Which?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: E Street Bridge. Were you going to mention that?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes. Supposing I start with that. The E Street Bridge—I have to presume that you are familiar with the proposal of long-standing of the commissioners to build a bridge at E Street, and over the rather strenuous objections of the Planning Commission to that proposal. You may not know that the Planning Commission did retain Mr. Bartholomew when he was independent to make a survey and a report on the E Street Bridge and related traffic problems. He came up with a very strong opinion that there should not be a bridge at E Street. He since and subsequently to his appointment as chairman of the Planning Commission has repeated that very strong objection to an E Street Bridge, even though it might even cost less than a bridge somewhere else. He feels very strongly that it would impinge upon the downtown area to such a degree of creating currents of cross-traffic, congestion, that it would be intolerable.

MR. BELLUSCHI: So he used actual practical reasons for it.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes; I feel that he did and it is all set forth in the report that is a public document and that is obtainable; and perhaps your Commission ought to have a copy of his report. As an alternate to the E Street Bridge, the Planning Commission has come forward with the proposal to build a bridge just downstream from the now-existing new 14th Street Bridge, cutting across a portion of East Potomac Park and so that angles over to what we call Roaches Run. That was presented at the last meeting of the Planning Commission and as a result of the discussions at that time it was agreed that there would be a financial and a planning analysis of the two proposals, the E Street as contrasted with what we call the Roaches Run Bridge.

There was a committee established consisting of Mr. Nolen, a member of my own staff, and two members of the Commissioners' staff to analyze the cost and the related traffic problems. In other words, heretofore the cost of any bridge that has been talked about has merely been the structure from shore to shore and it has not taken into account all involved traffic lanes,

approaches and improvements to streets in the city that would be automatically required in order to make any bridge function. So they are going at it on that premise that not only will the cost of the bridge itself be considered, but the cost of the approaches and improvements to the city streets, either in the city or in Virginia, so that it is fully a functional facility rather than how much does a bridge cost from abutment to abutment which has been the criterion heretofore. They have promised to come up with their answers to that question before the next meeting of the Planning Commission which, I think, is scheduled for next month, in December. But independent of whether a bridge costs more or whether it costs less, there are other legal aspects of the impairment of Roosevelt Island, the memorial to Mr. Roosevelt, which I think is of paramount importance and which the Roosevelt Association is trying to fight strenuously to preserve.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: They are prepared to bring an injunction, are they not, or whatever legal action they can take to preserve the integrity of Roosevelt Island.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes. I think they are prepared to take whatever steps are necessary. In our office we are very much interested but we have tried to keep ourselves detached from it, the internal squabble, though we have not been able to keep out of it altogether. We have received a great many resolutions and actions of civic associations and groups such as the Committee of One Hundred of the Nation's Capital, and the Georgetown Citizens' Association -- two of them, to be specific. Arch Brown and the Izaak Walton League and others are all objecting to the crossing of the bridge at E Street which would be across Roosevelt Island.

It is, I believe, obligatory on the Commissioners to present a recommendation of some kind to the next session of the Congress. They are late now in presenting their recommendation because, when they were instructed by the Congress to make a survey of bridges across the Potomac, they were also instructed to report back at the last session which they did not quite meet. So General Prentiss feels he is obliged to report at this session. What the outcome will be is anybody's guess. It is the contention of the Planning Commission which is strongly bolstered, in my view, by a very discerning analysis by the Chairman, Mr. Bartholomew, that Roaches Run Bridge would cost less, but that it will function to serve the city much better and the traffic requirements because all of your principal streets are north and south and the lanage of your north and south streets are not nearly so occupied and they have much greater portention for further use than the east-west which are for the most part narrow. The east-west flow of traffic which would be generated by the E Street Bridge, it is thought at least by the Planning Commission, would require the widening of E Street and other parallel streets plus a double tunnel underneath the south portion of the White House grounds which would be a rather distressing thing in order to keep the traffic from ramming itself head-on into the White House grounds. As it is now, you know, in the morning and in the evening, in its effort to get around the President's grounds, it gets all snarled up and it is an intolerable situation. What will come of it, I don't know. I can say that insofar as the Park Service is concerned that we are very much opposed to a bridge at E Street if for no other reason than that we feel honor-bound to observe the integrity of the memorial as established

by law and all the requirements of it, and it well may be that that memorandum may come to you officially be some committee of the Congress to determine whether or not in your opinion a bridge across Roosevelt Island would impair its national character.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We have not been asked by the Congress for a report on that?

MR. CAEMMERER: Not as yet; no, sir.

MR. PEETS: I think I would consider the tunnel under the White House grounds to be a greater sacrilege than the invasion of Roosevelt Island.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: That would involve some destruction of the grounds of the Treasury, would it not, where the Sherman monument is?

MR. THOMPSON: I hardly think it would involve more than a widening of the street south of the Treasury. It would call for a widening on the south side of it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: And going underneath the south end of the White House grounds?

MR. THOMPSON: Those in the Planning Commission, including Mr. Bartholomew, would say that in order to carry the traffic and to pick it up and disperse it, a tunnel is necessary. The Commissioners may think otherwise. They may think they could handle it by widening two or three streets, E, and F Streets. It also means a triple deck structure under Washington Circle if an E Street Bridge is to be built. I think that is recognized by everybody. K Street as it comes through and impinges upon M Street now calls for, and it is in the making, a double-deck interchange there; but if an E Street Bridge is built, it would be a triple-deck going on down below these two decks in order to carry that traffic that would be picked up by Rhode Island Avenue.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It seems to me from what Mr. Thompson says that this traffic situation is something in which this commission has been greatly interested, although I do not think the traffic aspect is our responsibility but rather the esthetic feature that would result from the invasion of Roosevelt Island; and also, of course, we are concerned with the Government keeping its word in accepting Roosevelt Island as a park. I think both of those points weigh very heavily against the E Street Bridge.

MR. THOMPSON: I think I furnished copies of the report which we in the Park Service prepared. That sets forth a great many of the esthetic reasons why, in our opinion at least, a bridge at E Street would be an infringement on the Memorial Bridge.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We have advised the District Commissioners that we do not approve or advocate the E Street Bridge for those two reasons and we have not been asked for our opinion by anyone else; that is, by no other official body.

MR. THOMPSON: It is merely conjecture on my part but I would imagine that before the thing is through it is certainly going to be resolved on The Hill and not by bodies such as ours or the Planning Commission because it has gotten beyond that stage.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I would think we would be asked for a report to the Congress which we would be prepared to make, I am sure; but I did not know whether the studies had been completed sufficiently to get involved in this local fight that is going on now.

MR. THOMPSON: I do not think it has, yet.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I wondered if it would not be wiser to wait until we get the report, the Bartholomew report, as to the cost of the bridge and so on because that might settle the whole matter.

MR. THOMPSON: It may be.

MR. CAEMMERER: There is a provision in the current District of Columbia Appropriation Act which prohibits spending money for an E Street Bridge.

MR. THOMPSON: That could be handled by new legislation that would be introduced.

MR. CAEMMERER: At any rate, whatever they do, they have got to have the endorsement of the Appropriations Committee.

MR. THOMPSON: That's right. They would have to get it because we are prohibited as of now from spending money from any source for a bridge at E Street.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: How soon do you think the Bartholomew report will be ready?

MR. THOMPSON: The Bartholomew report is ready.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: On the Roaches Run Bridge, and the approaches?

MR. THOMPSON: No; that will be ready, I should say, within two to three weeks, but the original study prepared by Bartholomew on the E Street Bridge is available and your Commission ought to have a copy of it.

MR. CAEMMERER: I will ask Nolen for a copy.

MR. THOMPSON: It is very well done and very discerning.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Are there any questions?

MR. THOMPSON: At the last meeting of the Planning Commission he very strongly repeated his recommendations that even though an E Street Bridge were to cost less and in his offhand guessing he thought it might cost as much as $10 million more than a bridge down the river, even though the

down-river bridge cost as much or more, he would still prefer it for traffic reasons. That is a very brief summary of the situation as I see it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Thompson.

MR. CAEMMERER: Pardon me; I did not want to interrupt you.

MR. PEETS: I am anxious that we should not miss any points that Mr. Thompson had in mind to discuss with us.

MR. CAEMMERER: One is on that Rock Creek Park Driveway.

(b) ANACOSTIA BRIDGE

MR. THOMPSON: Let me give you a brief report on something which you asked and I do admit I have done insofar as I can, on the Anacostia Bridge. You will recall that we had two or three meetings at which you assembled a list of several suggested or recommended changes in the design and features of the bridge which we drew up. We had our engineers revise the designs to incorporate the various suggestions of this Commission. We then processed them through the Public Roads Administration and to the final contractor, Mr. Charles Tompkins and his corporation, and we came up with a most surprising figure that instead of costing less, which we had every reason to think your changes would result in, they wanted almost $70,000 more to do less work which is something that you understand as well as we. It was a change-order. Anything involving changes, they were figuring anticipated profits and so on and so on. Nevertheless, we then went at it item by item and the best that we could work out of it were two items which called for, I think--one of the principal things that you wanted done, you will recall, Mr. Peets--the iron or the metal guards or guard rail for the entire length rather than to run them into a butted stone. That we have accomplished but we had to call upon the provisions of the specifications which permitted us to increase quantities of any specific item to accomplish that; otherwise that would have cost us more -- the end result being that we have adjusted the wing walls to your suggested changes and the handrail, but that is the extent of the changes that we were able to get out of our funds.

MR. PEETS: Reducing the number of breaks in the wing wall.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, sir; but that is under way and I can give you a stack of correspondence that thick which resulted in this whole effort to accomplish your suggested changes--

MR. PEETS: I think we should express our appreciation of that effort.

MR. NEILD: The difficulty is that the drawings were prepared for approval after the contract was awarded. Of course, our hands were tied.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think you have done the best you could possibly do.

MR. BELLUSCHI: That can be avoided in the future.

MR. THOMPSON: I have taken cognizance of your previous comments.

(c) Highway Through Rock Creek Park

On the Route 240, I do not know whether I can give you any information on it that you have not read in the papers, and, if you have read the papers, you will see that even the Planning Commission and State Road Commission seem greatly confused as to what the other party means. I also read in the papers that certain attorneys that have been retained by the citizens' groups in Montgomery County are prepared to take court action and to get out an injunction against the local or the National Capital Planning Commission and, I think, the Maryland Planning Commission, for permitting even the circumferential route to occupy a portion of Rock Creek Park in Montgomery County. I do not know what that will result in. I have been present at, I think, all of the principal meetings of the Planning Commission and the State Roads Commission and the Maryland Commission at which the problem has been discussed and it is quite confused as I see it as to what each party means. I think the thing that probably concerns this Commission most is what is the position of the Park Service insofar as Rock Creek Park in the District is concerned?

Our position has been rather clearly stated by our Secretary and our Director in open letters to the President and to others, that we are unalterably opposed to the bringing of a six-lane all-purpose road through Rock Creek Park. I am fearful that we may be faced with some such highway in the not too distant future because I think that Maryland is carrying the baton for the District in this case, that they have a pride of authorship in bringing it down and thrusting it on to the east-west highway and if a six-lane all-purpose road is dependent on the east-west highway, it is going to be awfully difficult to stop it from coming through the park in some fashion. We ought to have a map to talk from. But you are all familiar with Rock Creek Park and you do know that the westerly border of it is Oregon Avenue and the widening of Oregon Avenue to an all-purpose or four or six-lane has been on the plans, the general plan of the Planning Commission to which the commissioners and our office have subscribed for a number of years.

MR. CAEMMERER: This is the Washington and Vicinity Map.

MR. PEETS: In fact, the Washington Post Map or plan is posted there.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes; I think it is carried here. As I said earlier, I think that the State seems bound and determined — I think they are doing everything within their power to maneuver both or either Planning Commission into a position where they can use even a little piece of Rock Creek Park in Maryland for their Route 240 — it is not shown on here — this inter-county belt freeway which would help if they cannot get down there in the park, then my guess is, and I think it is a fairly reasonable one, that they will bring their Route 240 outside the park and down to the east-west highway through private properties where the Planning Commission and the Maryland Commission have no authority or no reason to object. They have

Mission mo
Creek Park

the right to condemn which I think they may well do and exercise that right to condemn private property to bring 240 down and dead-end it here. If it comes that far, it is an intolerable situation because this east-west highway is loaded to capacity morning and evening and that throws a thrust right at Rock Creek Park. I mentioned earlier that there has been on the general development plan and the traffic plans for the District, to which all agencies subscribe, the widening of Oregon Avenue which is a border street of the park and the Park Service accepts that as a way of getting traffic into the city if it has to be brought in without going down through the central part of the park itself. I wish I could give you something more factual about it but there is so much confusion and it has not yet been resolved, even though they attempted to resolve it at the latest meeting of the Planning Commission at which the full membership of the Maryland Road Commission and all the interested Planning Commissions in this area were associated.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: What do we have going through the park now, two main highways?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, sir; Beech Drive -- it flows along with the general flow.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would that necessitate widening the lower part of Rock Creek Drive in the park where it comes down toward Constitution Avenue?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes. There again we probably ought to have some maps. It has been on the general traffic plan of the District for a great many years, that Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, as distinguished from Rock Creek itself; they are two separate things. Rock Creek Park itself was established and developed quite a long time before there was any thought given to Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway. Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway was established by specific Acts of Congress and it was spelled out that it was for parkway and traffic purposes, with the cost being divided equally between the Federal Government and the District. As you know, now there are four lanes of traffic in Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway which are now loaded morning and evening to their full capacity; and even so, we have always felt that the ford below the Zoo ought to be improved to an all-weather crossing and so the current appropriation we have at hand sufficient funds to construct a bridge as a ford replacement. The ford will still remain there but just downstream from the ford it is our plan to build a bridge, a tunnel under that projection of the Zoo and then to lay eastward of Rock Creek not where the road now is across the other bank so as to completely free the Zoo from traffic, to cross Tilden Street and to join on to Colorado Avenue as a means of picking up 16th Street traffic in much the same manner that the traffic is now picked up from Connecticut and Massachusetts Avenues and that would use the lower portion of the parkway.

There have been pieces and comments in the paper recently that are entirely erroneous. I say that knowing that people would declare that we are destroying Rock Creek Park by even that much of an invasion of the park. The facts are that what we call the Colorado Avenue connection has been planned rather carefully and additional land was bought some three years ago

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: What do we have right through the park now, two main highways?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, two; Beach Drive -- it flows along with the natural flow.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would they necessitate widening the lower part of Rock Creek Drive in the park where it comes down toward Constitution

MR. THOMPSON: Yes. There again we probably ought to have some maps. It has been on the general traffic plan of the District for a great many years, that Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, as distinguished from Rock Creek itself; they are two separate things. Rock Creek Park itself was established and developed quite a long time before there was any thought given to Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway. Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway was established by specific Acts of Congress and it was spelled out that it was for parkway and traffic purposes, with the most major divided specific between the Federal Government and the District. So you know, now there are four lanes of traffic in Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway which are now loaded morning and evening in their specific, and ever so, we have always felt that the Fort Drive ought to be improved and the Williamsburg weather crossing and so the current appropriation we were at hand available funds to construct a bridge as a Fort Drive. The fund will still remain there but just downstream from the Fort Drive we will have a bridge, a tunnel under the intersection of [illegible] to let the pedestrians of Rock Creek not have the [illegible] completely free the Zoo from [illegible], to cross Tilden Street and to Fort on to Colorado Avenue as a means of picking up [illegible] Zoo traffic in the same manner that the traffic is now taken up from Connecticut Avenue Massachusetts Avenues and that would [illegible] the parkway.

There have been plenty of comments [illegible] entirely erroneous. I say [illegible] are destroying Rock Creek Park by [illegible] The facts are that what we call the Colorado [illegible] planned rather carefully and additional land was bought [illegible]

as additions to Rock Creek as bearing for this connection independent of the original Rock Creek acquisition itself so that it would lay directly upon the easterly border of the park upon land that was acquired specifically for the Colorado Avenue connection, and would not impinge upon the park itself and lay up and out of the valley and attempt to handle some traffic from 16th Street coming down into the park through a short tunnel and under the zoo and feeding into the Rock Creek Parkway.

I have oversimplified the whole thing greatly; but if we can avoid it, we certainly will do everything we can to avoid the projection of Route 240 through Rock Creek. I think that would be an intolerable thing. You only have to realize that the topography in the lower reaches of Rock Creek Park, the farther down you get the more rugged it becomes and your profiles are very rugged. It would create tremendous scars, and there are, I think, four principal interchanges that would be involved, complete interchanges, each one taking up 15 to 30 acres in the heaviest and wooded portions of the park.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think that sounds ominous for Rock Creek Park and naturally the Commission would not be in favor of anything like that. It has not reached a point yet where the Commission can take any position. When would that point arise?

MR. THOMPSON: I don't think in the immediate future because any plans the District may have, and they do have plans or at least locations suggested for six lanes through Rock Creek, is in what they call their second priority list which is six years from now or thereabouts, the point being that now is the time to do our talking to try to avoid the Maryland people from dumping six lanes on the east-west highway. There it becomes a must because the Commissioners can only say we must handle the traffic. I will be glad to try to answer any questions, if you have any. It is not clear; it is hazy, all these involvements.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Yes.

(d) Dutch Carillon

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Do you have any questions, Mr. Peets?

MR. PEETS: By the way, does the Nevius Tract come into your list of topics for discussion today?

MR. THOMPSON: No, but I can discuss it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We would like to hear about that.

MR. PEETS: And whether the Dutch bell tower is still involved in that picture?

as additions to Rock Creek as bearing for this connection independent of the original Rock Creek acquisition itself so that it would lay directly upon the easterly border of the park upon land that was acquired specifically for the Colorado Avenue connection, and would not impinge upon the park itself and lay up and out of the valley and attempt to handle some traffic from 16th Street coming down into the park through a short tunnel and under the zoo and feeding into the Rock Creek Parkway.

I have oversimplified the whole thing greatly; but if we can avoid it, we certainly will in everything we can to avoid the projection of Route 240 through Rock Creek. I think that would be an intolerable thing. You only have to realize that the topography in the lower reaches of Rock Creek Park, the farther down you get the more rugged it becomes and your profiles are very rugged. It would create tremendous scars, and there are, I think, four principal interchanges that would be involved, complete interchanges, each one taking up 15 to 20 acres in the heaviest and wooded portions of the park.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think that so as omnibus for Rock Creek Park and naturally the Commission would not be in favor of anything like that. It has not reached a point yet where the Commission can take any position. When would that point arise?

MR. THOMPSON: I don't think in the immediate future because any plans the District may have, and they do have plans or at least locations suggested for six lanes through Rock Creek, is in what they call their second priority list which is six years from now or thereabouts, the point being that now is the time to do our talking to try to avoid the Maryland people from dumping six lanes on the east-west highway. There it becomes a must because the Commissioners can only say we must handle the traffic. I will be glad to try to answer any questions, if you have any. It is not clear; it is hazy, all these involvements.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Yes.

(d) Dutch Pavilion

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Do you have any questions, Mr. Peets?

MR. PEETS: By the way, does the Nevins Tract come into your list of topics for discussion today?

MR. THOMPSON: No, but I can discuss it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We would like to hear about that.

MR. PEETS: And whether the Dutch bell tower is still involved in that picture?

MR. THOMPSON: I shall have to call upon my memory at this point. I think you are familiar with the acquisition of the Nevius Tract and the way in which it came about. Some three months ago, I was requested to join Ambassador Van Roijen and the Dutch Minister of Finance who happened to be in this country at the time to have a look at the Nevius Tract in order that someone residing in Holland would have at least a visual knowledge of where the Nevius Tract was and what it was all about.

The sum total of our meeting resulted in a quick trip to the site, pointing out where it was and my explaining that it was pretty much overgrown with weed growth at the present time. There were no questions asked or answers given as to whether or not it was a good site or a bad site for a bell tower. It was simply that he, the Minister of Finance, wanted to be able to say that "I have seen the Nevius Tract" in case somebody asked about it. The bell tower was not even discussed.

Since that time, the Ambassador has addressed a letter to our Secretary saying, in effect, that he has been -- I think this had better be off the record at this time.

(Discussion off the record)

MR. de WELDON: I would like to say something to be put into the record.

(e) Marine Corps War Memorial site

I feel it is very bad that the men who have given their lives to uphold the Five Freedoms are denied a memorial on the Nevius Tract near Arlington Cemetery, where so many of them are buried, in order to reserve the land to erect a monument to the Five Freedoms which are supposed to be alive and don't need a memorial. They are alive; the Five Freedoms are not dead yet so that we have to erect a memorial as we do to something past. Our ideals of government, American ideals for which these men over a period of 178 years of American history have given their lives, are still here with us. We do not have to erect a memorial to the Five Freedoms.

MR. PEETS: In other words, the Marine Memorial should have a fair chance to get a site in the Nevius Tract.

MR. THOMPSON: I think that we can properly say that there has been no refusal on the part of the Secretary to set aside or to consider this site for the statue designed by Mr. de Weldon. I think you will find our Secretary is of the opinion that there was an obligation to honor a previous promise to consider the bell tower problem. This does not preclude his considering the Iwo Jima Memorial or other proposals. It is certainly a wide-open question. At this time I feel certain that he has not said, no.

Has he said, "No" to the Iwo Jima proposal?

MR. THOMPSON: I shall have to call upon my memory on this point. I think you are familiar with the circumstances of the Mevina Treaty and the way in which it came about. Some three months ago, I was requested to call on the Ambassador Van Zorten and the Dutch Minister of Finance who happened to be in this country at the time to have a look at the Mevina Treaty in order that someone residing in Holland would have at least a visual knowledge of where the Mevina Treaty was and what it was all about.

The sum total of our meeting resulted in a quick trip to the site, pointing out where it was and my explaining what it was pretty much overgrown with weed grown at the present time. There were no questions asked or answers given as to whether or not it was a good site or a bad site for a bell tower. It was simply that he, the Minister of Finance, wanted to be able to say that "I have seen the Mevina Treaty" in case somebody asked about it. The bell tower was not even discussed.

Since that time, the Ambassador has addressed a letter to our Secretary saying, in effect, that he has been -- I think this had better be in the record at this time.

(Discussion off the record)

MR. de WINDOM: I would like to say something to be put into the record.

(c) Marine Corps War Memorial site

I feel it is very sad that the men who have given their lives to uphold the Five Freedoms are denied a memorial on the Mevina Treat near Arlington Cemetery, where so many of them are buried, in order to preserve the land to erect a monument to the Five Freedoms which are supposed to be alive and don't need a memorial. They are alive; the Five Freedoms are not dead yet so that we have to erect a memorial as we do to something past. Our ideals of government, American ideals for which these men over a period of 178 years of American history have given their lives, are still here with us. We do not have to erect a memorial to the Five Freedoms.

MR. PEETS: In other words, the Marine Memorial should have a fair chance to get a site in the Mevina Treat.

MR. THOMPSON: I think that we can properly say that there has been no request on the part of the Secretary to get said or to consider this site for the statue designed by Mr. to Weldon. I think you will find our Secretary is of the opinion that there was an obligation to honor a previous promise to consider the Bell Tower problem. This does not preclude his considering the Iwo Jima Memorial or other proposals. It is certainly a wide-open question. At this time I feel certain that he has not said, no.

Has he said, "No" to the Iwo Jima proposal?

MR. de WELDON: No, he has not; but he has not said "yes," either.

MR. THOMPSON: He has expressed the opinion that there was a commitment made by his predecessor, the previous Secretary of the Interior, who has said he would discuss the possibilities with the Ambassador. I can say that so far there has been no firm commitment on that score other than to consider locating the bell tower on the Nevius Tract.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would it be a suitable place for the carillon tower from the point of view of persons who would want to hear the bells play? And the height of the tower on that hill near the airport?

MR. THOMPSON: You are asking my personal opinion?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Yes, your personal opinion.

MR. THOMPSON: My personal opinion is that if you were to build only a carillon tower on an area of this size and devote the whole Nevius Tract to it, it would be an unwise use of such an important site because it would be lost. It would be like a large post sitting over there. It would be lost completely in an area of this size.

I do think, however, it is conceivable that a great monumental structure, designed on low horizontal lines so that it would not break into the axial view would be quite another thing. It is conceivable that a carillon tower of not more than 140 or 150 feet might well be and I think could properly be incorporated as an element of the design of such a structure. I think that is conceivable.

As for the appropriateness of putting a carillon at this location as contrasted with a great many other places, I think it is acceptable. I have read all the books that I can find in the Library of Congress and elsewhere on the subject of Carillons, and there are several. Several volumes have been written by Americans but mostly they have been written by European authors. I come up with this general impression: that a carillon to be properly located, not as they do in Europe because there they are corporate parts of the city squares and they like it. We in this country have not been educated to the point where we as a people fully appreciate carillon music. I don't happen to fully understand it myself.

One reason why we deliberately put the little carillon on Meridian Hill was to test the ear reaction of the people living in that area; and it has, I must say, been given a rather good reception. We have had great many compliments of people who have told us that they enjoyed it. We have had two complaints: one objected because the bell noise scared away pigeons, and one from some other source -- which I thought were incidental.

They say that you ought to have an area where you can get people at least 500 feet away from the bells. You should not be too close. And from the standpoint that there is considerable acreage on the Nevius Tract, where great expanses of lawns could be developed is an asset in its favor.

MR. de WELDON: No, he has not; but he has not said "yes," either.

MR. THOMPSON: He has expressed the opinion that there was a commitment made by his predecessor, the pre-Vichy Secretary of the Interior, who was said he would discuss the possibilities with the Ambassador. I can say that so far there has been no firm commitment on that score other than to consider locating the bell tower in the Kerlin Tract.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would it be a suitable place for the carillon tower from the point of view of persons who would want to hear the bells? And the height of the tower on that hill near the airport.

MR. THOMPSON: You are asking my personal opinion?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Yes, your personal opinion.

MR. THOMPSON: My personal opinion is that if you were to build only a carillon tower on an area of this size and devote the whole Levine Tract to it, it would be an unwise use of such an important site because it would be lost. It would be like a large post sticking over there. It would be lost completely in an area of this size.

I do think, however, it is conceivable that a great monumental structure, designed on low horizontal lines so that it would not break into the vertical view would be quite another thing. It is conceivable that a carillon tower of not more than 150 or 170 feet might well be and I think could properly be incorporated as an element of the design. I such a structure. I think that is conceivable.

As for the appropriateness of building a carillon at this location as contrasted with a great many other places, I think it is acceptable. I have read all the books that I can find in the Library of Congress and elsewhere on the subject of carillons, and there are several. Several volumes have been written by Americans but mostly they are by European authors. I come to it with this general impression: that a carillon to be properly located, such as they do in Europe because there they are comparable parts of the city scene and they like it. We in this country have not been educated to the point where we as people fully appreciate carillon music. I don't happen to fully understand it myself.

One reason why we deliberately put the little carillon on Mercedes Hill was to test the ear reaction of the people living in that area; and it has, I must say, been given a rather good reception. We have had very many compliments of people who have told us that they enjoyed it. We have had two complaints: one objected because the bell noise scared away pigeons, and one from some other source -- which I thought were indicative.

They say that you ought to have an area where you can get people at least 500 feet away from the bells. You should not be too of se. And the standpoints that there is considerable acreage on the Levine Tract, where great expanses of lawns could be developed in an asset in its favor.

This site could be developed where gatherings of people in large numbers could be assembled, where large spaces for parking could be provided on the periphery in some way. I think it probably is as good as any place we could find in this area in that there would be a sounding board effect from the hills directing the music toward the city. I do not think people in the District would probably hear it.

You start looking about for various other spots and there are certain good reasons why they probably are not so good. We thought that probably a good place was somewhere out in the amphitheater in that Rock Creek expanse, out 16th Street. We find that every now and then a church will put in a series of bells or chimes or one of these electronic carillons and then, after a while, people start getting out injunctions against the darn things. Then, furthermore, there is a church directly across the street that has just recently installed a carillon, an electronic one, and it seemed there might be a bit of competition and if you gave concerts and the church decided to ring, too, with their concerts. It ought to be where there is not too much competition; it ought to be isolated. If there is a single little tower sticking up, I think it would be silly; but as a corporate element of the large memorial of some kind, whatever it is, I can conceive of it being an acceptable element.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It seems to me that there should be a decision reached very soon. The Dutch have given us those bells and we ought to provide a site. If we wait for some other building to be erected on the Nevius Tract, to the Five Freedoms or other memorials, it may be years before that is done. I would think that it would not be a good idea to keep the Dutch waiting so long, but that we should provide a site immediately. I would be sorry to see a tower on the Nevius Tract as high as two hundred feet. Is that not the height required, 150 to 200 feet?

MR. THOMPSON: I would say from 125 to not more than 150; that would be my guess.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It would seem to me that would not be a desirable addition to the landscape on the axis of the Lincoln Memorial.

MR. THOMPSON: I would not put it on the axis under any circumstances.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I can see, myself, no objection to putting it in Meridian Hill Park. It is a beautiful little park. It has people living around it who would enjoy the sound of the music. I would think that would solve the problem immediately, if you could go ahead and have them erect a tower there.

MR. THOMPSON: On Meridian Hill Park?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Yes. What would be the objection?

MR. CAEMMERER: Pardon me, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Thompson, there has been no Act of Congress to allow the erection of it.

This site could be developed where gatherings of people in large numbers could be assembled, where large scale parking could be provided on the periphery in some way. I think it probably is as good as any place we could find in this area in that there would be a soundtire board effect from the hills directing the music toward the city. I do not think people in the District would object to it.

You start looking about for various other spots and there are certain good reasons why they probably are not so good. We thought that probably a good place was somewhere out in the amphitheater in Rock Creek Park, but 16th Street. We find that every now and then -- church will put in a series of bells or chimes or one of these electronic carillons and then, after a while, people start getting up injunctions against the darn things. Then, furthermore, there is a church directly across the street that has just recently installed a carillon, an electronic one, and it seemed there might be a bit of competition and if you have conflicting the church decided to ring, etc., which they converts. It ought to be where there is not too much competition; it ought to be isolated. If there is a single little tower sticking up, I think it would be silly; but as a corporate element of the large memorial of some kind, whatever it is, I can conceive of it being an acceptable element.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It seems to me that there should be a decision reached very soon. The Dutch must be given de Soto and we ought to provide a site. If we wait for some other building to be erected on the Mevius Tract, to the Five Freedoms or other memorials, it may be years before that is done. I would think that it would not be a good idea to keep the Dutch waiting so long, but that we should provide a site immediately. I would be sorry to see a tower on the Mevius Tract as high as two hundred feet. Is that not the height required, 150 to 200 feet?

MR. THOMPSON: I would say from 125 to not more than 150; that would be my guess.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It would seem to me that would not be a desirable addition to the landscape on the axis of the Lincoln Memorial.

MR. THOMPSON: I would not put it on Pennsylvania under any circumstances.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I can see, myself, no objection to putting it in Meridian Hill Park. It is a beautiful little park. It has people living around it who would enjoy the sound of the music. I would think that would solve the problem immediately, if you could go ahead and have them erect a tower there.

MR. THOMPSON: On Meridian Hill Park?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Yes. What would be the objection?

MR. GARMENDIA: Pardon me, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Thompson, there has been no Act of Congress to allow the erection of it.

MR. THOMPSON: No.

MR. CAEMMERER: And you have to have it.

MR. THOMPSON: I think so.

MR. CAEMMERER: It is the law. Absolutely. You have got to have a law of Congress before that can be erected.

MR. THOMPSON: That will have to be resolved by the Congress.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think it would be a pity to have a separate commission appointed to develop the Nevius Tract and hold up the Dutch until that commission can be appointed.

MR. THOMPSON: If it is decided that it ought to go there, yes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Are there not commissions in existence now such as your own office and this office and the Planning Commission, and so on, that would be competent to recommend the development of the Nevius Tract?

MR. THOMPSON: Discussing it back and forth here I can point out other objections to the Nevius Tract for the bell tower. Unfortunately, it is right in the flight line of these northbound constellations and all the planes that pass. There is a tremendous roar caused by their pull-up off the north-south runway as they are climbing, and they are very low; there is a tremendous racket. You know the experience at our Watergate. The two just don't mix; airplane music and bell music just don't go together. Perhaps technology will correct this problem.

Furthermore, we have had to, much against our will -- we fought like demons to prevent putting a red light on top of the flag pole at Arlington House. But it just happened that the law was on the side that we couldn't get around, and we were obliged to do that. It looks like the devil -- at least I think it does -- the idea of a red light on top of the flag pole at Arlington. We said we would lower the flag pole and we will do other things. But they wanted the flag pole that high and it so happens that we are not in control of the flag pole. So there are a great many things that you have to think about: the appropriateness and the propriety and the size and the scale and the timing and the international implications, whatever they may be. There has been a suggestion sent in by somebody -- I think it was the Garden Club -- of a possible site in the arboretum for the bell tower. That certainly ought not to be discounted. If anyone has a good idea of where it ought to go, now is the time to have them.

MR. PEETS: It happens that I have had some discussion of this with Horace Peaslee. He was the designer of Meridian Hill. A year or so ago when the matter first came up I told him that I thought that out of ten people anywhere in the District, if you asked them where the bell tower should go, they would probably mention Meridian Hill first. They would not be aware of these difficulties, the personal difficulties of competition

MR. THOMPSON: No.

MR. CAEMMERER: And you have to have it.

MR. THOMPSON: I think so.

MR. CAEMMERER: It is the law. Absolutely. You have to have a law of Congress before that can be erected.

MR. THOMPSON: That will have to be resolved by the Congress.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think it would be a pity to have a separate commission appointed to develop the Nevins Tract and hold up the Dutch Hill thing commission can be appointed.

MR. THOMPSON: If it is decided that it ought to go there, yes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Are there not commissions in existence now such as your own office and this Planning Commission, and so on, that would be competent to recommend the development of the Nevins Tract?

MR. THOMPSON: Discussing it back and forth here I can point out other objections to the Nevins Tract for the bell tower. Unfortunately, it is right in the flight line of these northbound constellations and all the planes that pass. There is a tremendous roar caused by their pull-up off the north-south runway as they are climbing, and they are very low; there is a tremendous racket. You know the experience at our Watergate. The two just don't mix; airplane music and bell music just don't go together. Perhaps technology will correct this problem.

Furthermore, we have had to, much against our will -- we fought like demons to prevent putting a red light on top of the flag pole at Arlington House. But it just happened that the law was on the side that we could get around, and we were obliged to do that. It looks like the devil -- at least I think it does -- the idea of a red light on top of the flag pole at Arlington. We said we would lower the flag pole and we will do other things. But they wanted the flag pole that high and it happened that we are not in control of the flag pole. So there are a great many things you have to think about: the appropriateness and the proximity and the size and the scale and the timing and the international implications, whatever they may be. There has been a suggestion sent in by somebody -- I think it was the Garden Club -- of a possible site in the arboretum for the bell tower. That certainly ought not to be discounted. If anyone has a good idea of where it ought to go, now is the time to have them.

MR. PEETS: It happens that I have had some discussion of this with Horace Peaslee. He was the designer of Ferndian Hill. A year or so when the matter first came up I told him that I thought that sort of ter people anywhere in the District, if you asked them where the bell tower should go, they would probably mention Ferndian Hill first. They would not be aware of these difficulties, the personal difficulties of [illegible]

with other towers and that sort of thing. But he paid no attention to that; said it was absolutely impossible to put a tower in Meridian Hill Park.

I went up there and studied the matter carefully on the ground and felt that there was a chance and I talked with him about it and he considered the suggestion I made and said that that would be acceptable to him. The location that we were discussing was on the east side of the Meridian Hill Park at the break and at the east end of the big terrace, between the end of the big terrace and the Dante monument which seems to me to be the one location for a high construction in that park. And so that I think we said if the drift of opinion should favor a general location in Meridian Hill, at least the voice of the designer would not be raised against it.

MR. THOMPSON: We had in mind three things (indicating pencil sketch). Here is the little fellow that is there now. That is to be moved away. I do not know whether I am approaching it properly but I have the impression that wherever the bells are now erected in their tower coming over in the spring, ought to be in the general proximity of where the final tower is going to be raised; if it is to be a single tower, it ought not to be -- I think we ought not put this temporary tower across the river and build the permanent tower some place else. I think there is a kind of relationship that ought to be observed. Now, the temporary tower and bells will be over here sometime next year. But that is not the final tower; but there is yet to be this permanent tower which the Netherlands Government is presenting.

MR. PEETS: I think that could be done on Meridian Hill.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: If a decision were reached that Meridian Hill is the proper site, couldn't they go ahead with the erection of the permanent tower?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, that would be possible. It depends on the size and scale of the tower. There is a relationship between Meridian Hill and the Netherlands Embassy which is a rather happy relationship.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It was formerly the Ambassador's residence, and now they have a new residence; but the chancery remains there on 15th Street.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes. We have a completely open mind about it. It is rather a vexing problem and rather a delicate problem of relationship with the Netherlands people. Certainly the Nevius Tract is a prime site; there is no doubt about that -- if everything else were in its favor.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I would think it is the kind of decision that ought to be made and the competent bodies ought to recommend a site that we agree on as the proper one and get authority to erect the tower.

MR. THOMPSON: No agreement has been made, so far as I know, and I am sure I would know about it; I am sure there has been no commitment other than an open-minded willingness to consider something specific. And I think

with other towers and that sort of thing. Did he read an objection to that; said it was absolutely impossible to put a tower in Meridian Hill Park.

I went up there and studied the matter carefully on the ground and felt that there was a chance and I talked with him about it and he considered the suggestion I made and said that would be acceptable to him. The location that we were discussing was on the east side of the Meridian Hill Park at the break and at the east end of the big terrace, between the end of the big terrace and the Dante monument which seems to me to be the one location for a high construction in that park. And so that I think we said if the draft of opinion should favor a general location in Meridian Hill, at least the voice of the designer would not be raised against it.

MR. THOMPSON: We had an mind three things (indicating pencil sketch). Here is the little fellow that is there now. That is to be moved away. I do not know whether I am advocating it proper or not but I have the impression that wherever the bells are now erected in their tower coming over in the spring, ought to be in the general proximity of where the final tower is going to be raised; if it is to be a single tower, it ought not to be -- I think we ought not put this temporary tower across the river and build the permanent tower some place else. I think there is a kind of relationship that ought to be observed. Now, the temporary tower and bells will be up there something next year. But that is not the final tower; but there is yet to be this permanent tower which the Netherlands Government is presenting.

MR. PEET: I think that could be done on Meridian Hill.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: If a decision were reached that Meridian Hill is the proper site, couldn't they go ahead with the erection of the permanent tower?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, that would be possible. It depends on the situation and scale of the tower. There is a relationship between Meridian Hill and the Netherlands Embassy which is a rather happy relationship.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It was formerly the Ambassador's residence, and they have a new residence; but the chancery remains there on 16th Street.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes. We have a completely open mind about it. It is rather a vexing problem and rather a delicate problem of relationship with the Netherlands people. Certainly the Mexico Tract is a prime site; there is no doubt about that -- if everything else were in its favor.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I would think it is the Board's decision that ought to be made and the competent bodies ought to recommend a site so we could go to the proper one and get authority to erect the tower.

MR. THOMPSON: No arrangement has been made, so far as I know, and I am sure I would know about it; I am sure there has been no commitment other than an open-minded willingness to consider something specific. And I think

the next move is up to the Dutch people to say where they would like to have it specifically and then come before this Commission and the Planning Commission. Certainly, it should come before this Commission and the Planning Commission.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Do you think the Dutch people would expect to select a site here in Washington? I don't think we would expect to do so if we were giving a present to another country.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, they would like it.

MR. NEILD: Shouldn't we recommend a site to them?

MR. THOMPSON: Maybe give them a choice of two or three sites.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think myself that the Dutch would be hesitant to insist on any site.

MR. THOMPSON: I should think they would want to get on with it now that they have started.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I would like to see all the commissions make a firm recommendation for one site and why could we not agree on Meridian Hill? I can see no objection to it. I can see great objection to the Nevius Tract.

MR. THOMPSON: Meridian Hill is getting over-developed. I think we would be putting all our eggs in one basket. It has everything but the kitchen sink in it now: fountains and statues and walks and waterways and the two fountains at the top and the mall and the alleys and the miscellaneous assemblies of statuary here, there and everywhere. Instead of continuing to crowd more things into an already overcrowded area, it seems to me that we would be well to set this apart. I am giving you my personal reaction -- it makes a tower of a monumental nature quite secondary, another decorative thing in an area that is beautifully done but I think overcrowded at the present time.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Actually, I would think it would dominate that park. I think a bell tower would be the dominating feature of the park.

MR. THOMPSON: Then Dante and the other people become subordinate and President Buchanan and his statue and so on and so forth are completely a secondary thing. I think the Memorial to be truly effective ought to be out by itself so you can readily identify it and not be confused with a whole lot of other things. It is like putting just one more statue in a large statuary hall similar to the rotunda of the Capitol. They lose their meaning and effectiveness. If it is to be truly effective, it ought to be singular, something that you can contemplate separate from the other things.

MR. PEETS: It might be possible to take a different view of it if you think of it as a matter of civic art, as a matter related to the entire city.

What you say about distributing little items all around an area, if applied to a large scale, on a large scale, might suggest that here you have a start in the construction of fine little park with memorial value and significance and rather than piecemeal, distribute the new things, that they should be concentrated at points and that putting this bell tower into this existing construction would give it a habitat, give it a locality where it would be very strongly related to the site.

The present plan of Meridian Hill is very strongly related to its site and this, such a large feature as a bell tower, should not stand independently but should have a relation to other things around it to tie it in place to give it an organic character.

MR. THOMPSON: I think they would do it if they were doing it because there are only a very few free-standing, only two or three free-standing towers in Europe anywhere, much to my surprise. I thought there would be a lot but there are only two in Italy.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: The campanile in Venice.

MR. BIDDLE: What is the other; I thought you mentioned two.

MR. PEETS: In Pisa, when you come to that; but I would not consider the campanile and the Piazza San Marco separate. It is a very integral part of a large composition.

MR. THOMPSON: The kind of thing you are talking about.

MR. PEETS: I would think of this tower as serving for Meridian Hill Park what the campanile does to Piazza San Marco.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I am sorry, I do not know Meridian Park, but from the description of Mr. Thompson, I am afraid that to relate the tower to all those other statues is going to be quite different from relating San Marco--

MR. THOMPSON: That is related to 500 bits of different sculpture all around.

MR. BELLUSCHI: But they are all subordinate in the grand scheme.

MR. THOMPSON: He has a good point there.

MR. PEETS: If you count the objects in the Piazza San Marco you would be surprised at how many different things there are.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Especially the Basilica of San Marco which is right there in competition with the companile.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think it would be wise if the Commission drove up to Meridian Park today; we might look at it.

to Meridian Park today; we might look at it.

MR. THOMPSON: I might tell you this, that we have had the Nevius Tract I guess about a year, less than a year, and as you know it is overgrown with weed growths and I am proposing this year, this winter as a matter of fact, to clean off at least portions of it so we can have a look at it and come spring you will want to go over there and get an impression of what is there because you can't see it now.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would it come within your jurisdiction to recommend, if you should so desire, that the Nevius Tract be incorporated in Arlington Cemetery? Of course, it would have to be accepted by the Defense Department who have, I believe, charge of Arlington, haven't they?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: If that decision were made, would the recommendation not come from your office?

MR. THOMPSON: I think we would probably comment on it, concur or disagree. I don't think it would necessarily come from our agency.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Wouldn't you lose control of it if they became part of it?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It would prevent having a building erected on it. I should be sorry to see some great building erected there. We fought that for years. I think the only safe thing is to get the Nevius Tract either incorporated as a park, and then you would run the risk of having a building on it; but if it became part of Arlington Cemetery, there certainly would be no building erected there to compete with the Lincoln Memorial.

MR. THOMPSON: That would be a safe locking of the door against any buildings.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We have been debating these questions now for several years as far as the Commission is concerned.

MR. THOMPSON: I got the impression that the Defense Department was not interested in the Tract for a cemetery -- I don't know where I got this -- that they were not particularly interested. I think the feeling was out there that even if they have the Nevius Tract, if it were added to the cemetery, it would provide burial space for something like -- don't quote this -- something like 18 months or two years, a very short period. Of course, they are crowded and they are developing new spaces elsewhere now.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: They have to.

MR. THOMPSON: But at the rate they are bringing people back from overseas, it is loading up very fast. I know we would like to see a decision made about the Nevius Tract. I know this Commission has been concerned with it for several years and we are no nearer solution, and it seems to me it would be well to agree to something.

MR. THOMPSON: I might tell you this, there we have had the Devins Trust I guess about a year, less than a year, and as you know it is overgrown with weed growths and I am proposing this year, this winter or a matter of fact, to clean off at least portions of it so we can have a look at it and come spring you will want to go over there and get an impression of what is there because you can't see it now.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would it come within your jurisdiction to recommend, if you should so desire, that the Devins Trust be incorporated in Lexington Cemetery? Of course, it would have to be accepted by the Town Department who have, I believe, charge of Lexington Cemetery, haven't they?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: If that decision were made, would the recommendation not come from your office?

MR. THOMPSON: I think we would probably comment on it, concur or disagree. I don't think it would necessarily come from our office.

MR. BRILLHART: Wouldn't you lose control of it if they became part of it?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It would prevent having a building erected on it. I should be sorry to see some great building erected there. We fought hard for years. I think the only safe thing is to put the Devins Trust either incorporated as a park, and then you would run the risk of having a building on it; but if it became part of Arlington Cemetery, there certainly would be no building erected there to compete with the Lincoln Memorial.

MR. THOMPSON: That would be a safe looking of the door against any buildings.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We have been debating these questions now for several years as far as the Commission is concerned.

MR. THOMPSON: I got the impression that the Department was not interested in the Trust for a cemetery -- I don't know where I got this -- that they were not particularly interested. I think the feeling was out there that even if they have the Devins Tr ct, if it were added to the cemetery, it would provide burial space for somewhat little -- don't quote this -- something like 18 months or two years, I may be short there. Of course, they are crowded and they are developing new spaces elsewhere now.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: They have to.

MR. THOMPSON: But at the rate they are burying people here from overseas, it is looking up very fast. I know we would like to see a decision made about the Devins Trust. I know this Commission has been concerned with it for several years and we are no nearer solution, and it seems to me it would be well to agree to something.

MR. CAEMMERER: Yes; I think the Arlington Cemetery Memorial Division would take it over. Their complaint up to this time has been that they would have to pay the surplus property people.

MR. THOMPSON: Not now.

MR. CAEMMERER: Therefore, the way is clear to make it part of Arlington Cemetery.

MR. THOMPSON: To do whatever is proper.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: If we can, we might drive up to Meridian Hill Park.

MR. THOMPSON: It is certainly undetermined, the future of the Nevius Tract. My only plan is to clean it off so you can see it which you now can't do.

MR. PEETS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: How would it come before the Commission officially to recommend a site for the carillon tower? Is there a bill that should be commented on so that we could either approve the bill or give an alternative suggestion?

MR. THOMPSON: I do not know whether this will take place, but I should imagine that in the very near future that our Director will come before your Commission and ask your advice.

MR. PEETS: Excuse me; I think the original letter came to us from the State Department, did it not, and asked for suggestions as to locations.

MR. THOMPSON: State Department?

MR. PEETS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: But they really have no jurisdiction in the matter. I think it should come from a bill that is introduced in Congress on which we would be asked to make a recommendation.

MR. THOMPSON: Comment favorably or opposed to it.

(After a discussion of other matters, the following was said):

MR. de WELDON: I want to say that the Marine Memorial will take only four to six acres, and the Nevius Tract is a very appropriate location because so many of the fallen heroes -- and there were over 100,000 men who gave their lives since 1775 -- so many of them are buried in Arlington Cemetery. That is why that location is especially appropriate. Also, the natural setting which is similar to that of Mt. Suribachi where the flag was raised on top of a hill. That is the most comparable hill we have in the vicinity of Washington.

-- - --

MR. DAMMERSON: Yes; I think the Arlington Cemetery Memorial Commission would take it over. Their complaint up to this time has been that they would have to pay the surplus property people.

MR. THOMPSON: Not now.

MR. DAMMERSON: Therefore, who may be clear to make [illegible] Arlington Cemetery.

MR. THOMPSON: To do whatever is proper.

CHAIRMAN FINNEY: If we can, we might drive up the Hamilton Hill [illegible].

MR. THOMPSON: It is certainly understood, the purpose of the Devins Tract. My only plan is to clean it. If we can see in which you now can't do.

MR. PEETS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FINNEY: How would it come before the [illegible] officially to recommend a site for the certain tower? Is there a bill that should be commented on so that we could either approve the bill or give an alternative suggestion?

MR. THOMPSON: I do not know whether this will take place, but I should imagine that in the very near future that the Director will come before your Commission and ask your advice.

MR. PEETS: Excuse me; I think the original letter came to the State Department, did it not, and asked for suggestions as to location.

MR. THOMPSON: State Department?

MR. PEETS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FINNEY: But they really have no jurisdiction in the matter. I think it should come from a bill that is introduced in Congress on which we would be asked to make a recommendation.

MR. THOMPSON: Comment favorably or opposed to it.

(After a discussion of other matters, the following was said):

MR. de KELDON: I want to say that the Marine Memorial will take only four to six acres, and the Devins Tract is a very appropriate location, because so many of the fallen heroes -- and there were over 100,000 men gave their lives since 1775 -- so many of them are buried in Arlington Cemetery. That is why that location is especially appropriate. Here, the natural setting which is similar to that of Va. Surely it more than [illegible] the vicinity of Washington. What is the most comparable Hill we have in

(f) Great Plaza

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: If you have time, could you tell us is there any progress being made on the question of parking cars in the area around the Post Office Department opposite the Department of Commerce, in that square? Are any plans being made to develop that square as a plaza?

MR. THOMPSON: Not to my knowledge.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It seems to be in a sad state, the saddest it has been in for the last ten or fifteen years. To me, it is the greatest eyesore in Washington. I think it is the most-neglected bit of public property we have here. What is holding up its development?

MR. THOMPSON: The parking problem is one of those things you can talk for days about and nobody does much. I say that I feel private industry has done a very commendable job in the last two or three years in providing parking space throughout the downtown area.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: What affirmative action would be necessary? Would it need a bill in Congress to direct that that property be developed as a public plaza as intended?

MR. THOMPSON: You are speaking specifically about the Post Office Department?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I am speaking about the open space opposite the Commerce Department where the Straus Memorial Fountain is surrounded by motor cars every day; it is used as a commercial parking place, not even as a government one.

MR. THOMPSON: There have been a great many studies made of that engineering-wise. The Planning Commission has made rather elaborate projections of two and three-deck parking areas there in that hollow. You are speaking now about back of the District Building, back of the Straus Fountain?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Just east of the Straus Fountain.

MR. THOMPSON: The authorities, Public Buildings Administration, has leased it out from year to year to private enterprise upon bids and there have been, to my knowledge, three different engineering firms that have interested themselves in that particular property and each time they get into the cost of it, they back away from it because it is so fantastic because of the low water level there. You have to build -- if you got it down out of sight, you would have to build what amounts to a concrete tank and it throws the cost of parking, per unit, into figures that are just not within economic reason.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I can understand that, but there is not -- or is there any obligation to provide garage space on that square any more than on the Mall?

(f) Great Plaza

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: If you have time, would you tell us is there any progress being made on the question of parking cars in the area around the Post Office Department opposite the Department of Commerce, in that square? Are any plans being made to develop that square as a plaza?

MR. THOMPSON: Not to my knowledge.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It seems to be in a sad state, the saddest it has been in for the last ten or fifteen years. To me, it is the greatest eyesore in Washington. I think it is the most-neglected bit of public property we have here. What is holding up its development?

MR. THOMPSON: The parking problem is one of those things you can talk for days about and nobody does much. I say that I feel private industry has done a very commendable job in the last two or three years in providing parking space throughout the downtown area.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: What affirmative action would be necessary? Would it need a bill in Congress to direct that that property be developed as a public plaza as intended?

MR. THOMPSON: You are speaking specifically about the Post Office Department?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I am speaking about the open space opposite the Commerce Department where the Straus Memorial Fountain is surrounded by motor cars every day; it is used as a commercial parking place, not even as a government one.

MR. THOMPSON: There have been a great many studies made of that engineering-wise. The Planning Commission has made rather elaborate projections of two and three-deck parking areas there in that hollow. You are speaking now across back of the District Building, back of the Straus Fountain?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Just east of the Straus Fountain.

MR. THOMPSON: The authorities, Public Buildings Administration, have leased it out from year to year to private enterprise upon bids and there have been, to my knowledge, three different engineering firms that have interested themselves in that particular property and each time they got into the cost of it, they back away from it because it is so fantastic because of the low water level there. You have to build -- if you got it down out of sight, you would have to build what amounts to a concrete vat and it throws the cost of parking, per unit, into figures that are just not within economic reason.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I can understand that, but there is not -- or is there any obligation to provide garage space on this square any more than on the Mall?

MR. THOMPSON: I don't think so.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I should think you could develop the Mall to greater advantage.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Somebody might do it.

MR. FINLEY: I only mention it in irony.

MR. THOMPSON: You can mention it in fact because we have now one of the largest engineering firms in the United States that have personnel in this area at the moment analyzing the possibilities of developing parking space underneath the Mall.

(g) Old Patent Office Building

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Well, I am really very concerned about the careless approach to preserving the public spaces in Washington. Take this bill that was introduced to demolish the Patent Office and make a commercial parking lot there. It seems to me that is a new low in civic development if a bill like that should go through. It would seem reasonable to think it will not go through.

MR. THOMPSON: I don't know who sponsored it but one of our senators in the Evening Star --

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Senator Maybank. I have the clipping here.

MR. THOMPSON: Has interested himself in that problem.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I thought it might be wise, if the Commission would like to do so, for me to write Senator Maybank of the action this Commission has taken with respect to this bill.

MR. THOMPSON: I see.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: The stand he has taken in opposing this bill is very commendable. We have written to the Committee opposing it but I feel that the matter of the development of the plaza there with the Straus Fountain is being allowed to drift; there is no effort being made to rescue that site. I cannot understand why an effort should not be made.

MR. THOMPSON: You are asking me questions that I cannot answer in fact. You do meet periodically with the Planning Commission. I think that you would get a much more comprehensive answer to those types of questions from the Planning Commission than from me.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: But would your office -- would you like to see it developed as a plaza?

MR. THOMPSON: As a park.

MR. THOMPSON: I don't think so.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I should think you could develop the data to advantage.

MR. BELLINSON: Somebody might do it.

MR. FINLEY: I only mention it in jest.

MR. THOMPSON: You can mention it in fact because it may be one of the largest engineering firms in the United States that have offices in this area at the moment employing the technicalities of developing certain space underneath the Mall.

(e) Old Patent Office Building

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Well, I am really more concerned about the argument as to preserving the Old Patent Office building. When this was first was introduced to demolish the Patent Office and make a commercial parking lot there. It seems to me that is a new law in civic development if a bill like that should go through. It would seem reasonable to think it will not go through.

MR. THOMPSON: I don't know who sponsored it but one of our associates in the Evening Star --

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Senator Hayden. I have the clipping here.

MR. THOMPSON: That interested himself in that problem.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I thought I might be wrong, if the Commission would like to do so, I would be glad to write Senator Hayden of the action this Commission has taken with respect to this bill.

MR. THOMPSON: I see.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: The stand we have taken in opposing the bill is purely commercial. We have written to the Commissioners suggesting that the matter of the development of the plaza there with new federal buildings is being allowed to drift; there is no effort being made to preserve that site. I cannot understand why an effort should not be made.

MR. THOMPSON: You are asking me questions which I cannot answer in fact. You do most remarkably well for the Planning Commission. I think that you would get a much more comprehensive picture to those types of presentations from the Planning Commission than from me.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: But would your office -- would you like to see it developed as a plaza?

MR. THOMPSON: As a park.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Eliminate it as a parking lot?

MR. THOMPSON: Of course I would.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Eliminating all parking?

MR. THOMPSON: My personal view is that it would be much more desirable as a park area.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Than as a garage?

MR. THOMPSON: I have been distressed to find that broken concrete.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I am afraid it would take action of Congress to get anything done there.

MR. THOMPSON: I think it is administratively within the purview of Mr. Reynolds and his organization to rent or not to rent. It may be that he is obliged to but I think if you were to talk to Mr. Reynolds --

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We discussed it with him and the reason they gave is they like the revenue.

MR. THOMPSON: But they don't get a great lot of cash.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It would seem not an adequate reason to rent out park lands for revenue.

Well, we are grateful to you for all of this information you have given us.

MR. THOMPSON: This is an informal report. There is one more thing. People want to give us a park and they want to attach their names to it as donors providing we will accept their names on it.

(h) Rose Garden

The rose garden -- you wanted me to talk just a minute about the rose garden?

I would like to tell you. As you know, for years it has been our ambition to get under way with our rose garden which is on West Potomac Park, in this area. You are familiar with it because it went through this Commission and you approved the thing in principle as to site. We appointed a group of consultants and we have come up with a scheme which purports to be a rose garden outline. But as you know, the darn buildings occupying the spot there make it appear as if now there is little hope that we might get them off.

It came about in this way, that some five years in an omnibus bill of the Public Buildings Administration, it was stated that the temporary

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Eliminate it as a parking lot?

MR. THOMPSON: Of course I would.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Eliminating all parking?

MR. THOMPSON: My personal view is that it would be much more desirable as a park area.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Then as a garage?

MR. THOMPSON: I have been distressed to find that broken concrete.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I am afraid it would take action of Congress to get anything done there.

MR. THOMPSON: I think it is administratively within the purview of Mr. Reynolds and his organization to rent or not to rent. It may be that he is obliged to but I think if you were to talk to Mr. Reynolds --

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We discussed it with him and the reason they have is they like the revenue.

MR. THOMPSON: But they don't get a great lot of cash.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It would seem not an adequate reason to rent out park lands for revenue.

Well, we are grateful to you for all of this information you have given us.

MR. THOMPSON: This is an informal report. There is one more thing. People want to give us a park and they want to absorb their names in it as donors providing we will accept their names on it.

(7) Rose Garden

The rose garden -- you wanted me to talk that a minute about the rose garden?

I would like to tell you. As you know, for years it has been our ambition to get under way with our rose garden which is on West Potomac Park, in this area. You are familiar with because it went through this Commission and you approved the thing in principle as to site. We appointed a group of consultants and we have come up with a scheme which purports to be a rose garden outline. But as you know, the dare buildings occupying the spot there make it appear as if now there is little hope that we might get them off.

It came about in this way, that some five years in an omnibus bill of the Public Buildings Administration, it was stated that the temporary

buildings should remain and the ground under the building should become or should come under the administrative control of the Public Buildings Administration. By talking with Mr. Whittington, Chairman, and General Grant, Arthur Demaray, and I went up and got the thing and with Bert Reynolds' concurrence, I should say, turned around to the -- that is, as of June, next year, the buildings become the property of the Park Service. We just reversed the procedure, so that presumably we are now the landlords after June one. I have talked with Mr. Reynolds and he is quite sympathetic to getting them down if we can conceivably get the people in there now occupying these buildings out of there. In the meantime, we have worked with our consultants and with the Potomac Rose Society with this thought, that if we could make just a token beginning of a rose garden on West Potomac Park, it would be evidence of our intention to go ahead and do something more. So we have plowed the better part of two or three acres. We have prepared the soil in readiness for what we call our nursery and we want to test out several thousand different roses, rose plants there, to see if they are going to survive and will be happy in that particular location, which we think they will. So, we have been fortunate in having so many people who know about those things work with us and only last week we met and the Potomac Rose Society is going to present us with some three to four thousand budding rose stocks come the first of the year which we will plant there and about all we can do is to put a sign on it and say that this is a test plot for the future rose garden to be built here; but it would be an indication to the public of our intentions and maybe arouse some help. Mr. Reynolds again has said to me that he would be very happy to get a very strong, if not a nasty, letter from our Secretary to please get out. It would help him in his efforts to get out.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: To get people out of the houses?

MR. THOMPSON: So they can demolish the buildings so the place can be cleared, and the area filled and developed.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: There is no great housing shortage here now as there was a few years ago. Why should there be difficulty?

MR. THOMPSON: For office space. They are occupied.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: As offices?

MR. THOMPSON: That is right. And there is now in process a movement that is taking shape to move large numbers of people out of the central part of the city and I am hoping that the people now in West Potomac Park will be the first to move. But out in the vicinity of Greenbelt they are now in process of building houses -- not houses, huge office buildings to take care of thousands and thousands of people. The first unit will be ready for occupancy next year, the first of three huge office spaces which will be somewhat comparable to the temporary buildings in town.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: What sort of offices occupy those temporary buildings?

MR. THOMPSON: CIA.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: In West Potomac Park?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Well, that presents certain difficulties.

MR. THOMPSON: They cannot be shoved about easily because they say "for security reasons" and you can't ask any more questions.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think they have something there because they do not want to be surrounded by other buildings. I should rather have security than roses, as much as I like roses.

MR. THOMPSON: On the item you were asking me to report on --

Are there any other questions?

I wonder if your Commission has known that Mr. James Frazier who was a former member of this Commission has left us?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: A great loss. He died a month or two ago.

MR. CAEMMERER: Could I ask a question, not necessarily off the record, but about erecting a bell tower at Meridian Hill. You run counter to the Zoning Commission.

MR. THOMPSON: I had not thought about the Zoning Commission.

MR. CAEMMERER: Do you run counter to the Zoning Commission if you want to erect a big tower up at Meridian Hill?

MR. THOMPSON: You may have a point there; it had not occurred to me.

MR. PEETS: I think that could be adjusted if it should occur.

MR. THOMPSON: If that is the site that ought to be used, probably the zoning can be adjusted.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Thompson; it has been very helpful to have you here.

MR. PEETS: Very interesting, indeed, to have this talk with you.

(i) Japanese Lantern

MR. THOMPSON: I think I should report -- maybe I should be asking your advice on it -- but I have rather an awkward job this afternoon with

MR. THOMPSON: CIA.

CHAIRMAN PINLEY: In West Potomac Park.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN PINLEY: Well, that presents certain difficulties.

MR. THOMPSON: They cannot be moved about easily because they say "for security reasons" and you can't ask any more questions.

CHAIRMAN PINLEY: I think they have something there because they do not want to be surrounded by other buildings. I should rather have security than roses, as much as I like roses.

MR. THOMPSON: Do the items you were asking me to report on --

Are there any other questions?

I wonder if your Commission can know what Mr. James Fraser who was former member of this Commission now left us?

CHAIRMAN PINLEY: A great loss. He did a wonderful work.

MR. CAMMERER: Could I ask a question, not necessarily off the record, but about erecting a bell tower at Meridian Hill. You are counter to the Zoning Commission.

MR. THOMPSON: I had even thought about the Zoning Commission.

MR. CAMMERER: Do you run counter to the Zoning Commission if you want to erect a big tower up at Meridian Hill?

MR. THOMPSON: You may have a point there; it had not occurred to me.

MR. PEETS: I think that could be adjusted if it should occur.

MR. THOMPSON: If that is the either that ought to come down. Probably the zoning can be adjusted.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN PINLEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Thompson; it has been very helpful to have you here.

MR. PEETS: Very interesting, indeed, to have this talk with you.

(i) Japanese Lantern

MR. THOMPSON: I think I should report -- maybe I should be asking your advice on it -- but I have rather an awkward job this afternoon with

Commissioner Spencer. May I sit down to tell you about it? I would like to get your opinion on what I ought to do about it. Somebody in the State Department -- I don't know who it was, but someone associated with that activity in Japan has arranged for the shipment to this country of a nine-foot Japanese lantern. They have asked the Commissioners, would they accept it from the City of Tokyo and a group that has been assembled in Japan to give their attention to the 150th birthday of Admiral Perry's landing in Japan and when he opened the Open Door Policy and all that sort of thing, when that was brought into being. The thing, I am told, is on its way, some kind of a war ship landing at Norfolk. It will be brought here within two weeks, I think. The Commissioners have said to whoever they should reply, we will be glad to have it, and Mr. Spencer, I think, is going to accept this Japanese lantern on behalf of the City and he is wanting us to find an appropriate place in the general vicinity of the Jefferson Memorial because the Japanese cherry trees are there. He has asked me to join him to see if we can find an appropriate place for it. I am in somewhat of a quandary as to what position I should take. I have asked our attorneys, do we have to have a law to give us authority to accept it, and I am inclined to think we probably do not, in this instance, but there is the propriety of putting it there in the proximity of the Jefferson Memorial which I again question that it ought to be. I was hoping that I could persuade him that we ought to hold it as a feature of the rose garden.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: How would it be installed? Would there be a little tower or gateway?

MR. THOMPSON: I have never seen it. It is a granite thing, carved with a pagoda effect, probably. I have seen many. I have told you about all I know about it.

MR. NEILD: This is given by the Japanese Government to this country?

MR. THOMPSON: Given by the City of Tokyo and this association that has been formed to memorialize the landing of Admiral Perry in Japan.

MR. NEILD: Has it been officially accepted?

MR. THOMPSON: I think the Commissioners said they would accept it as a gift. The thing has gone through rather awkward channels and it is hard to back up and get things on the conveyor.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Some disposition must be made of it, and I should think just offhand it might be suitable to place it near the Japanese trees but not too near the Jefferson Memorial; -- couldn't you use some of the space down here at the foot of 17th Street.

MR. THOMPSON: Somewhere well away from the Memorial.

MR. CAEMMERER: This is a pending project before this Commission; it has been pending for 25 years.

MR. THOMPSON: We will see what a Japanese lantern is.

MR. CAEMMERER: A pretty thing. This project was, of course, held in abeyance because of the war the came on.

MR. THOMPSON: That lantern is a much bigger thing than this. This is nine feet high and weighs many tons and it is of very ancient vintage; it came out of some old monastery or whatever they are.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Is it an old lantern or a new one.

MR. THOMPSON: Two thousand years old, something like that.

MR. CAEMMERER: Let me take a minute to read this:

"November 30, 1921. In 1912, the City of Tokyo gave to the City of Washington a number of cherry trees that were planted in Potomac Park. The City of Tokyo now expresses the desire to complete that gift by commemorative stone lantern to be placed, if possible, near the trees and to bear suitable inscription reporting the gift of the people. The embassy therefore has pleasure to submit to your department -- and so forth."

This came from the State Department -- the proposed design and explanatory note together with the sample of the stone so that the suggestions may be submitted to the proper authorities for appropriate action. The embassy will be grateful if you will communicate to it whatever decision may be made so that it can be passed onto the City of Tokyo. And signed, Sado Saburi, Counsellor.

MR. THOMPSON: This is about the 25-foot thing, this proposal here. The one I have not seen is nine feet; it is supposed to be nine feet.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: That would not be a very conspicuous element in the landscape.

MR. THOMPSON: I think it could be tucked in the trees somewhere.

MR. BIDDLE: So the trees would screen it in some way.

MR. THOMPSON: I think it ought to be somewhere where there would be reflection of it in the water if it could be related so that you would see it landward and reflected in the water. Would you be distressed, would this Commission be distressed if Commissioner Spencer and I tentatively select some place well away from the Jefferson Memorial on the Tidal Basin, somewhere.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: As far as I am concerned, I would rather like it.

MR. CAEMMERER: This is 25 feet high.

MR. THOMPSON: We will see what a Japanese lantern is.

MR. CARMICHAEL: A pretty thing. This project was, of course, held in abeyance because of the war like everything else.

MR. THOMPSON: That lantern is a much bigger thing than this. This is nine feet high and weighs many tons and it is of very ancient vintage; it came out of some old monastery or whatever they are.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Is it an old lantern or a new one.

MR. THOMPSON: Two thousand years old, something like that.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Let me take a minute to read this:

"November 30, 1921. In 1912, the City of Tokyo gave to the City of Washington a number of cherry trees that were planted in Potomac Park. The City of Tokyo now expresses the desire to complete that gift by commemorative stone lanterns to be placed, if possible, near the trees and be bear suitable inscription reporting the gift of the people. The embassy therefore has pleasure to submit to your department -- and to ours."

This came from the State Department -- the proposed design and explanatory note together with the sample of the stone so that the suggestions may be submitted to the proper authorities for appropriate action. The embassy will be grateful if you will communicate to it whatever decision may be made so that it can be passed onto the City of Tokyo. Signed, Sado Saburi, Counsellor.

MR. THOMPSON: This is about the 25-foot thing; this proposal here. The one I have not seen is nine feet; it is supposed to be nine feet.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: That would not be a very conspicuous element in ore landscape.

MR. THOMPSON: I think it could be placed in the green somewhere.

MR. BIDDLE: In the trees would screen it in some way.

MR. THOMPSON: I think it ought to be somewhere where there would be reflection of it in the water if it could be relationed such was while the Lantern and reflected in the water. Could you be diplomatic, would this Commission be distressed if Commissioner Spencer and I tentatively place some place well away from the def ense Memorial on the Mall [illegible] somewhere.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: As far as I am concerned, I would rather like it.

MR. CARMICHAEL: That is 25 feet high.

MR. PEETS: A location that might be possibly reminiscent of Cleopatra's needle on the Thames which is at a curve in the bank of the Thames where you get views of it from different points.

MR. THOMPSON: I thought I ought to mention it to you.

MR. NEILD: Mr. Caemmerer, is this request still active -- the 1921 request?

MR. CAEMMERER: It was held in abeyance. We thought after the war it would be revived and sure enough it is being revived.

MR. THOMPSON: In another way.

MR. CAEMMERER: Practically the same thing. It comes from Japan.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think we are lucky to have a nine-foot one instead of 25 feet.

MR. THOMPSON: It would be a happy solution if we could say we have a Japanese lantern.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Thank you very much Mr. Thompson.

(Exit Mr. Thompson)

MR. PEETE: A location that might be greatly reminiscent of Claude's needle on the Thames which is at a curve in the bank of the Thames where you get views of it from different points.

MR. THOMPSON: I thought I ought to mention it to you.

MR. NEILL: Mr. Gammerer, is this request still active -- the 1/25 request?

MR. GAMMERER: It was held in abeyance. We thought after the war it would be revived and sure enough it is being revived.

MR. THOMPSON: In another way.

MR. GAMMERER: Practically the same thing. It comes from Japan.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think we are lucky to have a nine-foot one instead of 25 feet.

MR. THOMPSON: It would be a happy solution if we could say we have a Japanese lantern.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Thank you very much Mr. Thompson.

(Exit Mr. Thompson)

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

December 3, 1953

Dear Mr. Coe:

I am writing to confirm our discussion of your plan for a Junior High School near Fort Mahon Park.

The Commission members were much interested in your explanation of the way in which the plan had to be adjusted to the narrow and sloping site. A number of modifications of the plan were proposed, but after hearing your explanation of the difficulties involved in making any radical changes, the Commission concluded that an aesthetically satisfactory design was not possible within the limits of the proposed site.

We came to this opinion reluctantly because we feel that a large school group should have a worthy site, a site on which the structural masses and the open spaces may be integrated by a strong three dimensional organization. Such a design will express the importance of the school to the community and will foster loyalty and pride in the students.

We know that you share these views, because you have incorporated them in the many excellent designs you have brought before us.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,
Sgd.
David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Mr. Merrill A. Coe
Municipal Engineer
District Building
Washington, D. C.

ep/b

EXHIBIT B

Subject to Approval by
The Bureau of The Budget

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

November 17, 1953

Dear Mr. Graham:

I have received your letter of October 21, 1953, enclosing a copy of H. R. 5397, "To provide for the establishment of a National War Memorial Arts Commission and for other purposes." In accordance with your request, the members of the Commission of Fine Arts have given careful consideration to the bill and have asked me to make the following report as embodying their views on the proposed legislation.

The Commission noted that the bill provides for the erection of a National War Memorial Theater and Opera House in Washington. The Commission is glad to indorse this proposal, as, in their opinion, a community music center in the city of Washington is greatly needed. The Commission feels that the Federal Government would be justified in erecting such a building, and hopes that it may be done. It is assumed that, if and when such a building is authorized, its construction would be accommodated within the fiscal and budgetary policies of the President and the Congress.

As regards constructing a roof on the Carter Barron Amphitheater in Rock Creek Park, the Commission feels that we are not in a position at this time to express an opinion as to the desirability of carrying out this plan. The members of the Commission will be glad to consider the matter and to express an opinion if and when a design for such a roof is submitted to the Commission by the National Capital Parks, which has responsibility for operating the amphitheater.

The Commission would be happy to see a suitable building erected for the National Collection of Fine Arts, now inadequately housed in the National Museum. The Commission also hopes that funds may be provided for the National Collection of Fine Arts, so that it may purchase annually the best works of contemporary artists, especially American artists, and may make them available to all parts of the country by means of traveling exhibitions. This would accomplish one of the purposes of the bill, by encouraging American artists and making their works better known.

EXHIBIT C

The Commission feels that the best interest of the arts would not be promoted by the establishment of a National War Memorial Arts Commission, such as is contemplated in the bill. Many of the duties to be assigned to this Commission are now being carried out efficiently by existing Government agencies. It would be a mistake, therefore, in the opinion of the Commission to attempt to concentrate so many of these duties in one agency with the responsibility for the expenditure of large amounts of government funds, as provided in the bill. The views of the Commission, with reference to this and other matters, are set forth at greater length in the "Report to the President on Art Activities of the Federal Government", which the Commission has submitted to the President. Copies of the Report have also been sent to members of Congress and additional copies are enclosed herewith for the use of the Committee.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,
Sgd.
David E. Finley
Chairman

Mr. John O. Graham
Chief Clerk
Committee on Education and Labor
House of Representatives
Washington 25, D. C.

DEF:pav

C O P Y

THE WHITNEY MUSEUM OF AMERICAN ART

October 24, 1953

Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman
The Commission of Fine Arts
National Gallery of Art
Constitution Avenue at 6th St., N. W.
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear David:

George Biddle has given me your letter of October 17th, which he also read at the meeting on the 20th before you arrived.

I have no desire to prolong the controversy about the relation of the Commission of Fine Arts and the Advisory Panel, but certain statements in your letter necessitate a reply, for the record. Regarding your statement that Wheeler Williams and A. E. Brinckerhoff of the National Sculpture Society are members of the Advisory Panel, I wish to say that this is the first time that I or any other member of the Advisory Panel have heard this. May I point out that the Commission's Report, in its account of the joint meeting of the Commission and the Advisory Panel in 1951, says: "The Commission of Fine Arts heard the testimony of representatives of a number of associations in the field of fine arts, organized as 'The Committee on Government and Art' and serving, at the request of the Commission of Fine Arts, as members of an Advisory Panel of Experts, to present to the Commission the views of the organizations represented by members of the Panel." However, in the account of the hearing of June 26th, 1951, at which Mr. Williams and Mr. Brinckerhoff were present, nothing is said of their being members of the Advisory Panel of Experts.

Regarding Miss Hendricks, the delegate to the Advisory Panel appointed by the American Institute of Decorators was Nancy V. McClelland, with Miss Hendricks as one of the alternates. At the joint meeting in 1951 Miss McClelland was present as the delegate of the Institute. Miss Hendricks was also present, but since each organization was to be represented by only one delegate, she could not be considered as the Institute's delegate, although we were all of course very glad to have her with us. She must by now have received a copy of the "Report of the Advisory Panel" dated October 5th, 1953, as have all other members of the Committee on Government and Art.

Regarding the statements in the third paragraph of your letter, I should like to review the source of events at the time that President Truman authorized the Commission of Fine Arts to undertake a study of governmental art activities. A meeting of an ad hoc executive committee of the Committee on Government and Art was held in New York on January 16th, 1951, to consider the proper method by which the Committee's Resolution and its accompanying documents should be presented to the President. I had invited you to this meeting but you were unable to attend; but I had discussed the matter fully with

EXHIBIT D

you over the telephone before the meeting. At that meeting George Biddle and two others were authorized to explore the channels for such presentation to the President, and to report back to me as chairman. Mr. Biddle was not authorized to present the Committee's request formally to the President, which was my responsibility as chairman. I am enclosing a copy of my record of this meeting, written at the time.

The first indication I had of what had happened in Washington was your letter of January 29th, 1951. The second indication was a letter of January 30th from Mr. Biddle, with a copy of his letter to the President, of which I enclose a copy. As you can see, Mr. Biddle's letter to the President says nothing about the Committee on Government and Art; on the contrary, it strongly recommends the Commission of Fine Arts as the body to undertake the proposed study of governmental art activities. In the New York Times of September 13th, 1953 Mr. Biddle published a letter in which he quoted certain references to the Committee on Government and Art which he stated had appeared in his letter to the President. Mr. Biddle has since informed me that these references occurred in the original version of his letter to the President, but were omitted in the final version approved by you and by the Commission of Fine Arts.

I should like to add that the reasons given by you and by Mr. Biddle for the President's designation of the Commission of Fine Arts rather than the Committee on Government and Art as the body to undertake a study of governmental art activities were not mentioned in any way at the time. In fact, there was no explanation given by either you or Mr. Biddle of what had occurred.

I will not attempt to discuss the other points in your letter, as they are fully covered in the statement signed by all members of the Advisory Panel and sent to you on May 15th, 1953. In your letters to me following this statement, I can find no mention of Mr. Williams and Mr. Brinckerhoff as members of the Advisory Panel.

I repeat that I have no desire to prolong this controversy. I believe that the Committee on Government and Art has an important piece of work to do, and I do not wish to have our time and energy spent in matters of this kind. As I said at the meeting last week, I hope that the draft of the report prepared by the Executive Committee will be positive and affirmative, supporting the main objectives of the Report of the Commission of Fine Arts, even though we may differ on means of attaining these objectives. I am at present preparing a detailed agenda for the first meeting of the Executive Committee, which I hope will take place in two or three weeks. We shall be glad to have you attend on the basis suggested by you, not as a member of the Executive Committee but as a member of the Committee on Government and Art, and we shall be happy to have the benefit of your experience and knowledge in governmental matters. I will let you know as soon as possible the date of the meeting.

Sincerely yours,
Sgd. Lloyd Goodrich, Chairman
Committee on Government and Art

LG/pm
Enclosures 2.

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

November 9, 1953

Dear Lloyd:

I have your letter of October 24th with reference to the composition of the Advisory Panel of Experts. If I understand your letter correctly, you make the point, as you say, "for the record," that Wheeler Williams and Mr. Brinckerhoff, representing the National Sculpture Society, and Miss Hendricks, representing the American Institute of Decorators, have never been considered by you as members of the Advisory Panel and that the Panel consists of representatives of the organizations in the Committee on Government and Art who were present at the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts on May 22, 1951.

There should be no confusion on this point. There was never any thought on the part of the Commission of limiting membership in the Panel to organizations in the Committee on Government and Art. In the letter I wrote you on March 23, 1951, I said: "The Commission decided to form an Advisory Panel of Experts which would include the organizations represented on your Committee, and also representatives of organizations concerned with music, theater, and ballet." When you appeared with the others at the meeting of the Commission on May 22, 1951, you quoted from a letter you had written to the members of the Committee on Government and Art as follows: "As you know, David Finley, Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, has formed an Advisory Panel of Experts to assist the Commission in its current study of governmental art activities, this Panel to consist of representatives of each of the 12 national organizations represented on the Committee on Government and Art, and of certain other national organizations."

In addition to the organizations in the Committee on Government and Art, the Commission invited a number of other organizations to serve on the Advisory Panel. We are very grateful to all who did serve and were helpful to the Commission in giving us their views, either by oral testimony or written communications. We shall continue, therefore, to list on our records Miss Hendricks and Messrs. Williams and Brinckerhoff as members of the Advisory Panel.

I cannot see how this would affect you or the others in any way, except to necessitate the elimination of the word "unanimous" in your "Report of the Advisory Panel of Experts," of October 5, 1953. Also, it seems to me, your Report should be signed by those whose views it represents and a copy sent to the Commission of Fine Arts for our consideration.

While we would be sorry that some of the members of the Panel cannot agree with all the views and recommendations of the Commission as set forth in the Report, we would be glad to have the considered opinion of all who served on the Advisory Panel and to know of any recommendations they might wish to make after a study of the Commission's Report.

EXHIBIT D-1

The other matters mentioned in your letter were covered by a letter which I wrote to George Biddle, and which was read at the meeting in New York on October 20th.

Sincerely yours,
Sgd.
David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Mr. Lloyd Goodrich, Chairman
Committee on Government and Art
Whitney Museum of American Art
10 West 8th Street
New York 11, New York

DEF:pav

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

December 2, 1953

Dear Mr. Soutar:

I have received your letter of November 5th which I read to the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on November 17th.

The Commission understands that you would like to have either an equestrian or standing life-size statue of General Andrew Jackson. In the latter case, it should be more than life-size, possibly nine or ten feet high, as it loses scale when placed out-of-doors.

We do not know of any statue of General Jackson that is for sale, nor could the Commission suggest a place where such a statue might be found. Any city that has a statue of General Jackson doubtless would not want to part with it.

Before proceeding further in the matter, it would be necessary to have some idea of the amount of money which could be raised for procuring such a statue. The cost of a standing figure on a pedestal would be around $10,000, and an equestrian statue would cost nearer $50,000.

The Commission could, of course, suggest the names of competent sculptors to do this work for you. However, I think Mr. R. Sturgis Ingersoll, Land Title Building, Philadelphia, could be of great help to you. He is chairman of the Samuel Memorial Fund which has provided a number of statues and other works of sculpture for Fairmount Park in Philadelphia. He and his committee have had a great deal of experience in finding suitable sculptors, making contracts, etc. I have just talked on the telephone with Mr. Ingersoll and he tells me he would be glad to advise you and to suggest names of sculptors, preferably southern ones if you so wish, who would be competent to execute a statue of General Jackson.

I would suggest therefore, if you care to do so, that you write to Mr. Ingersoll and ask his assistance in this matter, giving him some idea of the amount of money your committee is prepared to spend.

If I can be of further assistance in the matter, I hope you will let me know.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,
Sgd.
David E. Finley

Mr. Lane Soutar
Executive Director
Beacon Safety Council
116 Fifth Street, S. W.
Hickory, North Carolina

EXHIBIT E

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

The Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, The Commission of Fine Arts, and Miss Katharine N. Rhoades, or Mrs. Eugene Meyer, as provided in Paragraph 4 of the Codicil to the Will of the late Charles L. Freer, have examined the following objects:

1 Bronze mirror, Chinese, Han dynasty.

1 Bronze Ram, Chinese, Han dynasty.

1 Bronze vessel of type p'an, Chinese.

1 Bronze vessel of type hu, Chinese, 5th century B.C.

1 piece Jade, Ch'in; Chinese.

1 Painting, flowers, Chinese, by Hsü Wei, Ming dynasty.

1 Painting, birds and peaches, Chinese, Sung dynasty.

1 painting, landscape, Chinese, by Wu Li, dated A.D. 1767.

1 Painting, Japanese, kakemono, attributed to Sosen.

1 pair Porcelain cups, Chinese, Ku-yüeh-hsüan type.

1 Pottery vessel, Chinese, Sung dynasty; mei-p'ing.

1 Pottery sundial, Korean, Koryo period,

Exhibit F

which have been recommended for purchase for the Freer Gallery of Art by Mr. A. G. Wenley, Director, and they hereby approve the purchase.

For the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

November 17, 1953

For the Commission of Fine Arts

First Draft

National Competition
For the Design of a United States Postage Stamp Date _____

I

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL of the United States has authorized a competition for a design of a postage stamp. This competition will be conducted under the following conditions:

II

The Director of the competition shall be:

JOHN DOE, President of the Society for the
Improvement of Postage Stamps

All correspondence relating to the competition should be addressed to the Director, in care of the Post Office Department, Washington, D. C.

III

THE JURY

The Director, acting with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, has appointed a jury to make the awards in this competition. The names of the persons serving on the jury, all of whom are well qualified judges of graphic design, will be announced by the Director at a date not more than ten days later than the date of this program.

IV

PARTICIPANTS

The Director, acting with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, will invite twenty (20) citizens of the United States, each of whom has attained some distinction in the arts of design, to submit to the jury designs for a postage stamp. Those who accept this invitation, in a letter addressed to the Director and mailed not more than five days after the date of this program, shall be considered participants in this competition.

EXHIBIT G

The Director reserves the right to invite additional persons to become participants; provided, however, that the total number of participants shall not exceed twenty.

The names of all participants shall be sent to each participant.

Each participant shall receive an honorarium of one hundred dollars to be paid when the designs are submitted to the jury.

V

PURPOSE OF THE COMPETITION

The purpose of the competition is to place at the disposal of the Postmaster General a design for a United States postage stamp created by the most excellent talent in the Nation. United States postage stamps enter every home in our country; are the most active of all documents in our commercial life; and abroad are our most eloquent ambassadors. They ought to be beautiful.

VI

REQUIREMENTS FOR DRAWINGS TO BE SUBMITTED

The following requirements for the drawings to be submitted are mandatory. No drawing will be brought to the attention of the jury unless the participant who submits it has complied rigidly with these requirements. The purpose of this rule is to make sure that each participant shall present his design on a basis equal to that afforded all other participants:

1. The design shall be drawn in pencil (in pencil only) and colored with transparent water-color.

2. The actual size of the drawing shall be ____ x ____ inches, the shorter side being the base of the design. Drawings made at a larger or smaller size will be declared Outside of the Competition by the Director.

3. The drawings shall be made on sheets of Bristol Board of good quality, white in color and with a semi-glossy surface. The size of this sheet shall be ____ x ____ inches.

4. Such sheets shall be sent in packages which insure their delivery without folding or breakage. Postage must be prepaid.

5. The design thus prepared shall include the following lettering and numerals:

UNITED STATES POSTAGE
8 cents 8

The number 8 shall occur twice and shall be conspicuous.

6. Each drawing shall bear a device or nom-de-plume in the lower right-hand corner of the sheet. With the drawing, each participant shall send an opaque envelope, sealed, on the outside of which there shall be drawn the device or nom-de-plume which appears on his drawing. Within the envelope there shall be a card with the name and address of the participant.

VII

ENGRAVING AND PRINTING

In making their awards the jury will consider the appropriateness of designs for the techniques ordinarily used in the engraving and painting of postage stamps.

The Director, acting with the advice of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of the United States Government, will prepare a description of the processes hitherto used in the publication of postage stamps. This description, in the form of a memorandum, will be sent to all participants.

VIII

DELIVERY OF DRAWINGS

Drawings of participants shall be delivered at the Post Office Department Building not later than noon on _____; provided, however, that drawings sent by mail shall be postmarked at a United States Post Office not later than 11:55 a.m. on that date.

After an examination by the Director, all drawings shall be simultaneously submitted to the jury by the Director on a date not more than two weeks after the date of delivery.

IX

JUDGMENTS

After deliberating not less than ten hours, the Chairman of the Jury shall notify the Director in writing of the recommendation of the Jury for the award. The Chairman shall indicate the design thus premiated by a Memorandum noted on the sheet upon which the drawing is made.

The Director, in the presence of the Jury, shall then open the sealed envelope which bears the device or nom-de-plume corresponding to that on the premiated drawing. He shall then announce the name of the participant who has submitted the premiated design.

The Director shall then notify the Postmaster General, and, when authorized to do so by the Postmaster General, he shall notify all participants.

X

THE PRIZE

A prize of one thousand dollars ($1,000) shall be paid to the participant whose design is premiated by the jury.

It is understood also that the design premiated shall be that of the new postage stamp to be issued by the Post Office Department; provided, however, that should the Postmaster General find that, because of technicalities in production or for any reason the premiated design cannot be used in this way, he shall consult with the participant who submitted this design and ask for such alterations as may make the design practicable for use as a stamp.

All participants in this competition agree, as a condition of participation, to collaborate in this way with the Postmaster General, if required to do so.

XI

QUESTIONS AND AMENDMENTS

During the progress of this Competition, any participant may address a question to the Director and the Director shall answer such questions as may properly relate to the competition. Both question and answer shall be in

writing and copies of both shall be sent to all participants.

Whenever the Director, in replying to a question in this way, marks his answer "Mandatory", both question and answer shall be considered amendments to the Program of Competition.

XII

OWNERSHIP OF DRAWINGS

All drawings submitted shall become the property of the Post Office Department; provided, however, that should the Department make use of any design, either for a postage stamp or as a documentary device, the designer of the design thus used shall receive an honorarium of three hundred dollars ($300) in addition to the honorarium paid to all participants. This provision shall not prevent the publication of any or all designs when such publication is authorized by the Postmaster General.

Mar 17 1953

(The meeting was reconvened at 2:30 p.m., in the office of the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

Present: The Commission, Mr. Robertson and Mr. Fellers of the Post Office Department, and Mr. Hall, Mr. McLeod and Mr. Christensen of the Bureau of Engraving.)

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We came to try to help you work out a plan for securing designs for the new issue of stamps.

MR. HALL: We are all interested, I presume, in the same matter.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We are delighted that you have shown such interest in the plan that Mr. Robertson told us about of having a new series of stamps and having a competition at least for the first one.

The Commission is very glad to be of any help we can in working out the whole scheme and organizing the competition, if one is to be held.

MR. ROBERTSON: That idea appeals to us.

MR. HALL: We look at this project, as I explained to Mr. Caemmerer over the telephone, as a Post Office project. We are only a contractor for the Post Office Department and we try to give the Department what it wants and we try to keep in the background so far as postage stamp matters are concerned and let the Post Office Department speak for the Bureau; and we want to cooperate in every way to meet whatever requests come to us from the Department and I am sure Mr. Robertson is anxious to meet the wishes of the public as well.

You started to say something, Mr. Robertson, and I interrupted you.

MR. ROBERTSON: I think this: that the more we think about it, if we are going to have a competition, we thought we ought to extend it perhaps beyond one stamp, maybe to four or five or six--perhaps not the whole series; but it seems to

EXHIBIT G-1

me a rather monumental job to organize a competition for just one stamp. We ought to get more than one good result. I think we might try for maybe five or six.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We thought maybe the end result would be if you did not give out the subject of the stamps but asked contestants to submit designs and then you found you had a number of good designs you could use for any denomination, perhaps, with numerals that are appropriate, you could buy the additional designs from the artists, who submitted them; in that way you would get more than one stamp. Is that not a possibility?

MR. HALL: That is a possibility, of course. You can switch your denomination to any design that you want.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I had a letter from Dean Hudnut who could not be here. He had expected to come, but we changed the date of our meeting and he could not break another engagement. He though we might get a better result if we did not give out the subject of the stamp but let the artist submit the subject. We should give him the numeral or whatever you want to appear on the stamps and let him submit a design.

MR. HALL: Wouldn't you have to place it in some category of some kind that he could work to, a presidential series or a series portraying scenes in the United States?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Yes, you would have those two categories and then a third one with subjects submitted by the artist.

MR. HALL: You would give him some category.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: You would have, say, the series of historical portraits containing the George Washington stamp. I assume you would want to keep the Lincoln stamp, and so on. That is one separate category. We were thinking in this first competition we would see what we could get in the way of a new design

for stamps--say the foreign mail stamp, and for these stamps--say the foreign mail stamp designs depicting such subjects as might appeal to them as suitable for the purpose.

MR. BIDDLE: David, I think I disagree with him. I think most artists would find it easier if at least you suggested half a dozen possible themes and then you could add to these if you want to, or if you preferred trying to do something else on your own, do it. I think most artists would be helped.

MR. ROBERTSON: Mr. Fellers had a suggested category which I think is a good starting place.

MR. FELLERS: In a meeting that Mr. Robertson had in his office, November 2, we figured there would be about eighteen stamps in the new ordinary series and we broke the stamps down into three categories.

The first category would include Franklin and some of our famous presidents.

The second category would be national scenery consisting of six stamps, like Niagara Falls, Panama Canal, Old Faithful, Pike's Peak, Grand Canyon, and the Statue of Liberty. The third category would contain six stamps also and show the American way of life, such as educational advantages, free elections, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, freedom from fear.

Now, I believe it is in that last category where we would need the help from outside artists as to how they would portray those different suggestions.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: In the abstract themes, that is.

MR. FELLERS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It would be in that category for which you would hold the competition.

MR. FELLERS: It would seem so to me.

MR. HALL: There would be more freedom there than in the other categories.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Yes.

MR. FELLERS: Now, the first category of presidents would be, naturally, portraits that we have not used on stamps before, or something you think would be unique and new.

Of course, the second category consisting of national scenery would--we could get famous pictures of Old Faithful and many pictures showing Old Faithful, Niagara Falls, Panama Canal, and so forth. So I think the first two would be very easily worked out but the last category would be very difficult.

MR. ROBERTSON: There would be more room for imagination.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: That is what we are trying to get, yes.

MR. BIDDLE: I was thinking it over, and was going to suggest, if it would be suitable to the Post Office, one other theme and that would be something like One World, or Communication by Land, Air, and Sea, or Freedom of Communication. I had in mind a theme that could be treated in a purely abstract way, to lend or give more scope of pure design to the artist.

One other: I don't know if also you would like the idea of some purely formal framing as we have had in all our stamps, and then possibly the animals of North America, the birds of North America, as suggested by some of Audubon's things; I don't mean necessarily a copy of his works; that would be a purely American theme, you know with certain animals, such as the elk and moose and so forth; and then the artist would have the chance of designing some sort of an abstract frame that it would fit into.

I also have in mind some sort of a theme to which he can lend scope in imagination as pure design.

When you get a thing like scenery or portrait of a president, it limits him terribly.

MR. ROBERTSON: Of course, there are any number of ideas and combinations of them. The philatelists seem to think that we ought to make this change rather gradually and perhaps preserve a fair portion of our more conventional stamps and then to take, say, a third of them into the realm of abstraction or pure design or whatever it may develop into.

MR. BIDDLE: Some of both.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think that is wise. You certainly want to keep the historical series, of portraits of the presidents.

MR. ROBERTSON: For the reason that if this is going to be a regular series, we shall have to keep it for quite a while.

It it were a commemorative stampand not successful, it fades out of the picture. Stamps--I mean the regular stamps are going to last quite a while.

MR. HALL: It was brought out that all of these stamps you are considering are the same size as the so-called ordinary size postage stamps.

MR. ROBERTSON: That is what we have been thinking.

MR. HALL: Otherwise, you could not use them in vending machines. If you get into a larger size stamp, you would make it more difficult. It would put coin machines out of business.

MR. ROBERTSON: May I ask you this, Mr. Hall? The Bureau will design under this plan that we are discussing, say, 12 of the 18 or 20 stamps?

MR. HALL: We had planned to do that.

MR. ROBERTSON: Would it be better to have this competition first so we can see just how we might fit the other stamps into the pattern, or would it be all right to just go ahead:

MR. HALL: I do not see any reason why both could not go on concurrently.

MR. ROBERTSON: I don't, either, but I was asking.

MR. HALL: Because you can always reconsider a design or you can postpone its introduction into the circulation. If an artist comes in with a different idea we can always modify what we had here to match in with it.

MR. ROBERTSON: Why don't we talk, then, about a competition, say, for several stamps. I do not know whether it should be a maximum of six or a minimum of six, or six. We might like them all. We might not like any.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: You might say that if you get six designs that are of the quality and kind that you want, that--

MR. ROBERTSON: So much the better.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: You might buy all six designs.

MR. BIDDLE: Wonderful.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I don't see why not.

MR. BIDDLE: The more designs that you throw open, the more artists that will be interested in it.

MR. HALL: One artist would submit six different designs, one for each theme?

MR. BELLUSCHI: May or may not.

MR. ROBERTSON: He might do just one.

MR. HALL: He has the privilege of submitting six under this?

MR. BELLUSCHI: That's right. He can submit more if he wants to.

MR. HALL: Of course, the minimum, if they want to participate in six categories, he could submit six or more than that if he wished.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Then if concurrently with the competition you would be designing the historical series here--

MR. HALL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Of the portraits of the presidents and so on--

MR. HALL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would you get an artist in on contract to give you a new design for the Washington head?

MR. HALL: We have four designers on our staff. I don't know whether you saw our reply to the report that was submitted to the Budget Bureau. We brought out the fact that we have a counterpart of the chief sculptor in the engraver of the mint. We have their counterpart in Mr. McLeod.

As a matter of fact, the man in the mint was trained under Mr. McLeod and came from the Bureau.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I did not see that report.

MR. HALL: We trained this young man in the work he is doing in the mint.

We have a counterpart, therefore, in addition to that; we have Mr. Christensen who is also an expert in engraving, and four men who are designers, recognized as bank notedesigners. Bank note designing is an art in itself. When our designers are given a little freedom, they do a good job. You can see some of it in the Perry stamp. That, for an example, was an original design of ours. And one or two others.

MR. McLEOD: The New York stamp, the last one coming in.

MR. ROBERTSON: We would like to see it.

MR. HALL: It was one developed here in the Bureau.

When you get down to the ordinary size stamp, you are restricted pretty much in what you can do. Here is a die proof of the original design made by one of our men in the Bureau.

We are not so proud of some of the others because the material is sent to us. Here is another original design of the Bureau.

MR. FELLERS: That Future Farmers--

MR. ROBERTSON: The trouble with the commemoratives is that--

MR. HALL: I will show you one which is not an original design. This is not an original design of ours, and neither is this.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Was this Ohio one submitted by someone out there?

MR. HALL: Submitted by a designer from Ohio. That was severely criticized. Of course, we take the criticism.

MR. ROBERTSON: The Post Office gets a little, too.

MR. HALL: There is another original design.

There are any number that we have originated here.

Your designs will be restricted to this area. Let me see if I have something that size.

MR. ROBERTSON: It makes the problem more complicated to have the small stamp, but that is what we are talking about.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: That is the normal size? Are all eighteen going to be that size?

MR. HALL: Must be, because otherwise you could not use them in vending machines.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Certainly.

MR. BIDDLE: When you spoke of accepting different designs, did that have any reference to the same number of prizes?

MR. ROBERTSON: I thought it was an award for each one.

MR. BIDDLE: That would answer a lot of the things we talked about.

MR. HALL: An award for each one accepted.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Up to six.

MR. ROBERTSON: Yes.

MR. HALL: For each theme.

MR. BIDDLE: Yes. But that would roughly mean six designs that you thought excellent.

MR. ROBERTSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: How much could you give? Suppose you did get six acceptable designs?

MR. HALL: The last time we had a competition, I think it was in 1937, it was $500 for the first design. Of course, the dollar is not worth what it was in 1937. I suppose it would have to be more than $500 now. I do not know. We have not had any experience in a matter of this kind. I do not know exactly what would be considered a fair award. Maybe the Commission might be in a better position to suggest what it thinks is a fair amount.

MR. BIDDLE: Why don't you mention that whole problem we talked about at lunch, the open and close, in reference to this, the 20, I mean?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Yes; but first to answer his question, perhaps if they had a thousand dollars or something like that for the first design, $500 or whatever you can pay for the others, would that appeal to the other artists, you think?

MR. BIDDLE: Yes.

MR. HALL: I am speaking of Post Office Department money.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY. He is very quiet.

MR. BELLUSCHI: You were not thinking of that?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Probably something of that sort would interest artists very much. We were talking about the method of setting up the competition, we thought it might be advisable to invite twenty well-known artists to compete and announce the names at the same time that you invited them, so that it would be awkward for them to refuse. They must show interest in this competition, and then you could throw it open to any other artists that wanted to compete also. You might get some very good designs from unknowns or people who are not in the list

of 20. It would be more popular and would spread the interest all over the country. You might also get some very good designs in that way. You could sort out the designs submitted without too great trouble, the jury could.

MR. HALL: Wouldn't you have some people feel hurt that they were not among the 20 if you draw a line between the 20 and the others that might be permitted to compete?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Perhaps. But I think it would make the competition more important if you could associate some well-known artists with it.

MR. HALL: Every artist thinks he is the best. But I mean you are going to have a hard time. Here is a man who thinks he is good and he has not been invited.

MR. ROBERTSON: This is sort of like a game of tennis. You want to get a few good players to assure the success of the tourney or tournament and anyone else can come in who wants to. Isn't that about it?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think so.

MR. BIDDLE: We discussed this whole problem and there is not any question about it that it would give enormous prestige and publicity to the competition if twenty names were selected by an outstanding jury and I think that would solve your difficulty of hurt feelings because it always comes back to the judgment of the jury.

MR. HALL: Undoubtedly that is right. I raised that point.

MR. BIDDLE: I think that is the answer to that.

MR. HALL: I do not know how many artists consider themselves eligible for the invitation. There may be a great many of them.

MR. BIDDLE: I have very much in mind that this first competition, the first held in a number of years, and one in which the Commission took any kind of

a sponsoring part, we should try to get the enthusiastic backing of the artists all over the country. I took it up with the president of Artists Equity and I am convinced myself that, if there were also a general competition there would be much more enthusiasm from the artists. We were talking about the possibility of combining the invited list which would give it a certain prestige, and then also allowing---

MR. HALL: Would that be made public?

MR. BIDDLE: Definitely.

MR. HALL: The list of those invited.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: That would be part of the reason for selecting them.

MR. HALL: In other words you would make it public that twenty artists have been invited to compete and anyone else who wants to may join the twenty.

MR. BIDDLE: Yes; and then have such an outstanding jury of selection appointed that it would, that the artists would feel that they had been, that the subject had been canvassed and this was an outstanding list although they might disagree in individual cases.

MR. HALL: What would happen if we had a repeat of what occurred in 1937, the person who designed the current issue of stamps was not an artist?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: He might become one in the process.

MR. HALL: These twenty artists might criticize the selection.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: That is something beyond our power to prevent.

MR. BIDDLE: We discussed that at lunch. One solution was that there be a prize offered to the best design of these twenty invited men so that they would know that they would get a prize and it would be such an outstanding list that you would be convinced that it would be a good design.

MR. HALL: You are getting around to two prizes, then?

MR. BIDDLE: The other prizes could be scattered around among either them or the other competitors.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think we were of two minds about that. Wouldn't it be better to have a prize of $1,000 for the first design or best design by whomever submitted, and then other prizes if you find five other designs that you want?

MR. HALL: Mr. Robertson has to leave?

MR. ROBERTSON: No, I find I don't.

MR. HALL: I was going to make arrangements for a car.

MR. ROBERTSON: I don't have to leave now.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: If you had additional prizes of $500 for each of the other five which you might be able to use, I don't see why all artists would not find that acceptable.

MR. BIDDLE: I agree with you.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I would be rather sorry to confine the top prizes or top prize just to the twenty that are invited. You might develop a better design from the uninvited.

MR. BIDDLE: As Peets asked, these twenty who would be invited, how would they be assured that one of the twenty would be selected?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: You can't insure it. I think they should submit the best design.

MR. BIDDLE: I disagree with what Peets said.

MR. PEETS: I suggested that if they were not offered a prize, what other advantage would there be to them?

MR. HALL: Let me inject this thought. We must keep in mind that we have the General Accounting Office auditing our accounts and when we buy anything we have to have something delivered and if we are going to give an award to an artist

simply because he is one of the twenty, and then we did not accept his design, we may get ourselves in trouble with the General Accounting Office.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: You would have to have a design furnished for that thousand dollars.

MR. HALL: We have to buy something.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I realize that I am also subject to the General Accounting Office.

MR. HALL: We were getting a little reckless with money for a minute or so.

MR. ROBERTSON: It seems to me that the whole idea is to buy acceptable designs.

MR. HALL: That is right.

MR. ROBERTSON: That is as far as we can go. I do not think we are in a position of awarding prizes. I think our position--

MR. BIDDLE: I used that expression--

MR. ROBERTSON: Of buying something.

MR. BIDDLE: You would invite twenty artists and buy one of those twenty designs. Would that be it?

MR. NEILD: I think they should buy the best design submitted no matter who submits it.

MR. ROBERTSON: It would seem so to me.

MR. NEILD: You are inviting twenty men to come in, you are showing them the courtesy--

MR. BELLUSCHI: I think you will have six prizes which correspond with six or eight or whatever the number and then give first and second and third and

regardless, and the jury is supposed to be competent to get the second best and the third best.

MR. HALL: That is about the way you have to operate.

MR. BIDDLE: And hope to God that one of the twenty get it. I think that is fair.

MR. ROBERTSON: It would not be first, second, third, fourth or fifth prizes. There would be five or six selections and each one of those would be a prize. It would be a first prize.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: You would have one that was best. You would give him $1,000 for best and you would have five at $500 which you would buy not necessarily the second, third, fourth and so on.

MR. BIDDLE: I would like to feel that if this outstanding jury selects twenty artists that they will select a group of twenty, one of which is at least sure to win one of the five.

MR. ROBERTSON: You would think so. But again, sometimes as with the number one tennis player, he gets put out.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: As regards organizing the competition, we were talking of how it could be done. We wondered if it would not be helpful if you got some well known person as director who is accustomed to conducting these competitions. I think if you would invite someone of the caliber of Fiske Kimball who has conducted competitions for Government buildings--I think he was chairman of the Lincoln Memorial Commission--someone of that sort who had standing in the art world--

MR. HALL: Yes; we had the head of the Public Buildings Branch of the Procurement Division handle the last one for us. What was his name--Bruce. Edward Bruce was chairman of the unit and he selected the jury and drafted the specifications and conducted the competition.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: You could pay something for the person who does that?

MR. HALL: I don't know. I don't think we could. I think that Public Buildings or whatever agency took it over, would have to act in an advisory capacity, as I see it. You could not put them on our payroll very well.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: You could make a contract, say, for a certain amount of money to conduct this competition.

MR. HALL: The only way to do it would be to throw the whole business into that agency and let them conduct it and we would buy from them.

MR. BIDDLE: I think Fiske Kimball could be persuaded to do it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: For nothing?

MR. BIDDLE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Yes, I think he would do it as a public service if you asked him to do so provided you could furnish the clerical help.

MR. HALL: That we could do very easily.

MR. ROBERTSON: Could we do that?

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. ROBERTSON: As I have been listening here, there might be two fiscal problems: buying of the designs which we could work out between the Post Office Department and the Bureau, and financing the competition might be something else. Can we do that? You spoke of the possibility of perhaps getting some money from somewhere.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It is possible, though it is hard to get. When appealed to, people say the Government is richer than anybody.

MR. BELLUSCHI: The Rockefeller Foundation--this would be down their alley; for certain parts of it they would be delighted to contribute something, especially if approached by the Post Office Department or the Bureau. But they

always feel: Why doesn't the Government have enough money to do that? But they do; they often contribute when there is something of an artistic nature.

MR. ROBERTSON: There are two problems here. One is the production of stamps which we can handle ourselves. The other is furthering the interest and participation in art which is really not a Post Office function.

MR. BELLUSCHI: It would be exactly there that they would be interested, in that part.

MR. HALL: The Government is a little cumbersome in handling a matter of this kind, as you know, under rules and regulations established by the General Accounting Office and the law requires competitive bidding. It complicates matters a little bit in handling a matter of this kind.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Isn't this a competitive bidding for the best design?

MR. HALL: Yes, it would be.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Haven't you got the money to conduct that competitive bidding?

MR. HALL: Yes, we have.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: That, it seems to me, is what we are doing here.

MR. HALL: But giving a man a thousand dollars whether he won or not--

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I don't think you could do that. You buy the best design and you buy the other five and then you have as an honorary chairman some outsider who could advise about the composition of the jury and so on and organize the competition for you and then the competition would be conducted by either this office or the Post Office Department, just as you would do if you were submitting bids for the Post Office Department.

MR. ROBERTSON: We think the Post Office Department should stay out of the competition in the first place. It is not recognized in the field of art.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We hope to recognize you now. We do recognize you, in fact. We certainly do. As a very important agency in the field of art.

MR. HALL: Where would your committee fit into the picture?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We fit in right now in trying to advise you how to get the competition organized and to secure suitable designs from the artists.

MR. HALL: After we get the things operating and making a selection, how are we going to get the benefit of your advice on what is the best design?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: That ought to be done by a jury.

MR. HALL: By your jury?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Not ourselves as a jury, but by a jury which we could select.

MR. BIDDLE: Would he be willing to appoint a jury?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: No, I think if you had someone to conduct the competition, let us assume that it is Mr. A or Mr. B or Fiske Kimball or someone else, and then he would suggest some names to the Fine Arts Commission. We would advise as to whom we thought was suitable for the jury and then they would be invited by the director of the competition to serve on the jury or perhaps the Postmaster General would write a letter inviting him just as he would write to the director of the competition; I think that most people would serve under these circumstances.

MR. HALL: I don't like to let your committee out of the picture.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We are not going to get out of it. We would be glad to have the competition conducted under the joint auspices of the Post Office Department and the Commission of Fine Arts.

MR. HALL: If the stamp is a poor design, I want to blame somebody.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: You want us. No, we are not going to leave you in the lurch.

MR. ROBERTSON: I would like to take a more positive view of it, that to have this competition closely identified with the Commission is the whole point of the thing. You represent the art of the country.

MR. HALL: That is the point I want to make.

MR. ROBERTSON: We are merchants and Mr. Hall is a manufacturer.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We are hoping to help you in that way. We would recommend a person qualified to direct the competition and then advise with him as to suitable jury of qualified people to judge the competition. He would be able to organize the mechanics of the thing and you would send out the notices through your regular channels and I hope you could post them up in the Post Office over the country; that would give the most publicity and public notice to the artists and so on; and, when it came to selecting a design, the jury would choose what they think are the best designs and submit that to the Post Office Department, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, as to whether they could be used or whether you liked them. You might not like the choice of the jury.

MR. ROBERTSON: There is always that possibility.

MR. BIDDLE: I would like to see the Commission come into the picture from a somewhat different point of view. I think it is awfully important that the American artists feel that the Government as represented by the Commission of Fine Arts is doing an intelligent thing in their behalf. It seems to me in some way instead of simply saying that the Commission sponsored it or--

MR. ROBERTSON: Under the auspices of.

MR. BIDDLE: I would like to bring them into the picture.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Certainly.

MR. ROBERTSON: That is what we want.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I hoped you would say that.

MR. HALL: I want you to stay in the picture. I think it is important.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: You can use "auspices" or "cooperation" or something, using the name of the Commission of Fine Arts along with that of the Post Office Department.

MR. BIDDLE: I think it is important to give the artists the feeling that the Government is doing an intelligent thing and that the cooperation of the Post Office Department and the Commission of Fine Arts is putting over an intelligent program.

MR. PEETS: I trust that the artists in the country appreciate that and don't say: Look what they gave us; six little postage stamps.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think they would appreciate this effort, which is at least a step in the right direction.

MR. NEILD: If we get an outstanding jury, is that not the best test, to pass on a design?

MR. BIDDLE: The answer is that the artists have appreciated for thirty years what Bruce did in that Section of Fine Arts.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Multiplied by a million--six stamps.

MR. BIDDLE: If we do that, they may grouse but fundamentally they will appreciate it.

MR. ROBERTSON: I think it is a thing that has been talked about so much and we all want to do it. I think we should try.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We have a rough draft of a plan for a competition which Dean Hudnut sent to us. I have not gone into it in great detail, but it will furnish a talking point. I will read his draft if you would like me to do so.

National Competition for the Design of United States Postage Stamps. The Postmaster General of the United States is authorized to sponor a competition for a

design of a postage stamp. This competition would be conducted under the following conditions:

The Director of the competition shall be John Doe, (whatever he is, his title). All correspondence relating to the competition should be addressed to the director in care of the Post Department, Washington, D. C.--or should it be the Bureau of Engraving and Printing?

MR. ROBERTSON: Or the Commission.

MR. ROBERTSON: We haven't the clerical staff. We have a secretary and one stenographer on our staff.

MR. NEILD: To Mr. Hall's department here.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I should think here.

MR. HALL: I don't like to see the Post Office Department getting out of the picture. Usually the Post Office asks the Bureau to make the design. I suppose under those circumstances the channel would be the Post Office, the Bureau, to the competitors.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think it should go to the Post Office Department because that is the easiest thing for artists to remember.

MR. HALL: More prestige in the Post Office.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I will continue reading. The director acting with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, appoints a jury to make the awards for this competition and the names of the persons serving on the jury, all of whom are well qualified in graphic design, will be announced by the director at a date not more than ten days later than the date of this program.

Participants: The director, acting with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, will invite twenty citizens of the United States, each of whom has attained some distinction in the arts of design to submit to the jury designs for

a postage stamp. Those who accept this invitation in a letter addressed to the director and mailed not more than five days after the date of this program shall be considered participants in this competition. The director reserves the right to invite additional persons to become participants provided, however, that the total number of participants shall not exceed twenty."

MR. NEILD: That is in question.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Yes, I think that is so. "The names of all participants shall be sent to each participant." That would not be possible if it is thrown open.

MR. BIDDLE: That would be simply these twenty.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Of the selected twenty.

MR. BIDDLE: Twenty invited, yes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Dean Hudnut suggested that each participant shall receive an honorarium--suggested that--but that you cannot do with Government funds.

MR. HALL: I do not think so.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: You could only buy the winning design, so that would have to be left out.

MR. ROBERTSON: Or else we can get some private contributions.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Yes, private contributions.

Purpose of the competition. The purpose of the competition is to place at the disposal of the Postmaster General a design for a United States postage stamp.

MR. BIDDLE: Six.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: "Six designs for United States postage stamps created by the most excellent talent in the Nation. United States postage stamps enter every home in our country and the most active" and so forth.

Requirements for drawings to be submitted. The following requirements--drawings to be submitted--are mandatory. The drawing will not be brought to the attention of the jury unless the participant who submits it has complied rigidly with these requirements. The purpose of this rule is to make sure that each participant shall present his design on a basis equal with that afforded all other participants. The design shall be drawn in pencil, only, and colored with transparent water color. The actual size of the drawing shall be blank by blank inches, the shorter size being the base of the design. The drawings made larger or smaller will be declared outside of the competition by the director. The drawing shall be made on sheets of bristol board, good quality, white in color with semigloss surface. The size of this sheet shall be blank by blank inches. Such sheets shall be sent in packages which insure their delivery without loss or breakage. Postage must be prepaid. Design thus prepared shall include the following lettering in numerals: United States Postage, 8 cents, or whatever it is; the number shall occur twice and shall be conspicuous--whatever your rules are about that.

Each drawing shall bear a device or nom de plume in the lower right hand corner of the sheet with the drawing, and so forth.

In making their awards, the jury will consider the appropriateness designs for the techniques ordinarily used in engraving and printing of postage stamps. The director, acting with the advice of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of the United States Government will prepare a description of the processes hereto used in the publication of postage stamps. This description in the form of a memorandum will be sent to all participants.

Delivery of drawings. Drawings of participants shall be delivered at the Post Office Department building not later than noon on blank date; provided, however,

that drawings sent by mail shall be postmarked at a United States Post Office not later than 11:55 a.m. on that date.

After an examination by the director, all drawings shall be simultaneously submitted to the jury by the director on a date not more than two weeks after the date of delivery.

Judgments. After deliberating not less than ten hours, the chairman of the jury shall notify the director in writing of the recommendations of the jury for the award. The chairman shall indicate the design thus selected by a memorandum noted on the sheet upon which the drawings is made. The director in the presence of the jury shall then open the sealed envelope which bears the device or nom de plume on the premiated drawing. He shall then announce the name of the participant who has submitted the premiated design. The director shall then notify the Postmaster General and when authorized to do so by the Postmaster General he shall notify all participants.

The prize of the payment--whatever you want to call it--payment of $1,000 shall be paid to the participant whose design is premiated by the jury. It is understood also that the premiated design shall be that of the new postage design--shall be issued by the Post Office Department.

However, should the Postmaster General find that because of technicalities in production or for any reason the premiated design cannot be used in this way, he shall consult with the participant who submitted this design and ask for such alterations as may make the design practicable for use as a stamp. All participants in this competition agree as a condition of participation to collaborate in this way with the Postmaster General if required to do.

Questions and amendments. During the progress of this competition, any participant may address a question to the director and the director shall answer

such question as may properly relate to the competition. Both question and answer shall be in writing and copies of both shall be sent to all participants.

Would that be possible?

MR. BIDDLE: This is all provisional.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Whenever the director in replying to a question in this way--his answer shall be mandatory--both question and answer shall be considered amendments to the program in the competition.

Ownership of drawings. All drawings shall become the property of the Post Office Department provided that should the Department make use of any design either for postage stamp or as a documentary device, the designer of the design thus used shall receive an honorarium of $300 in addition to the honorarium paid to all participants. This provision shall not prevent the publication of any or all designs from such publication when authorized by the Postmaster General.

There would be some changes, of course, in that.

MR. HALL: I think it would be well to leave that copy here; let our legal boys go over it very carefully and polish it up to see--

MR. BIDDLE: This was intended only for one award and so it would be changed.

MR. ROBERTSON: There would be six. This would be like the purchase prize in an art show.

MR. BIDDLE: This was intended only for the closed competition of twenty men. Of course, the wording would be changed.

MR. HALL: This restricts the design to a line engraving, not the lithographic or photographic, photogravure, or any other process.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: For these six.

Would you like that--

MR. HALL: We are not equipped to do it any other way.

MR. NEILD: That is information you would have to give us to transmit to these people.

MR. McLEOD: Here is something I would like to add.

The type of drawing they spoke of, it being in color--it should be a wash drawing, black and white, just a wash drawing.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would you like it in color?

MR. HALL: We are not equipped to do multicolor work.

MR. NEILD: You would not intend to use color on these stamps at all?

MR. McLEOD: We can interpret because the color is not selected until after the engraving is made.

MR. NEILD: Should not the designer indicate the color that he has in mind?

MR. HALL: You don't see any harm in doing that, letting him submit a design in color with the understanding, of course, of only one color?

MR. McLEOD: But you see, Mr. Hall, if you don't mind my bringing this up at this time. During that last competition they submitted that in a light green and we had to practically redraw that whole thing to make it fit our proportions. We even went over to the capitol, the statuary area there, and photographed a good many of those silhouette forms of statues to give us the detail that we required for that, and that is why I say most of those drawings in color, when you rephotograph those things as many times as we have to get models and things like that. You lose a lot of your values when you don't do that in black and white.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Could there be a suggestion of color at the side? You said there is only one color. That is two or three colors are out completely.

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. McLEOD: That was another question, that this Bureau is going to do these in one color. If these were intended for other multicolored uses that would be another question entirely.

MR. HALL: The point I am making is that it should be designed for one color. We are not equipped to print more than one color on a stamp by the process that we employ.

MR. BIDDLE: Would this be permissible under that statement, to let the white of the paper come out, to count as a color?

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. McLEOD: Absolutely.

MR. BIDDLE: So you could have a red border on a white exterior; so you really get three colors: black, white, and red.

MR. McLEOD: You get that in effect in our prints right here.

MR. BIDDLE: That Ohio one.

MR. HALL: The white shows up particularly in the New York stamp. White does a big job in the New York stamp.

MR. BIDDLE: I think the Ohio one had three.

MR. McLEOD: When you go into printing as we do, this represents the print from the original die, so you get this from the plate. There is a slight stain that takes place from that which is a production problem.

MR. BIDDLE: You could use black, white, and color.

MR. FELLERS: You can't use black and white.

MR. McLEOD: Black and white as you would call a normal wash drawing in India ink because you can get all your tonal values in there that we require.

MR. BIDDLE: The black and color would mean two printings?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: You could change that to conform with your requirements.

MR. HALL: We will do that, of course.

MR. ROBERTSON: There are some other suggestions. I would not put in the denomination. You can always put that in--send it back to the--

MR. BIDDLE: You put that in?

MR. ROBERTSON: No; send it back to the artist.

MR. HALL: They would have to figure some place in the design.

MR. ROBERTSON: It could be changed.

MR. HALL: It could be any denomination.

MR. McLEOD: Any design that the Commission would accept as far as it being redrawn or be brought up to qualities that would be required in making a stamp, it would not be necessary to send it back to the original artist to do that. If it was necessary, we could do that ourselves. We have done that before.

MR. HALL: We have changed the denomination; we can change that any way we want.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Suppose the artist gives you a certain style of numeral that we cannot use.

MR. McLEOD: We can follow that.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Could you follow that by changing the digit?

MR. McLEOD: That's right. We could come to an agreement that that same series was to be followed up; we would at least agree in part as to what that style would be for the others rather than to use our own judgment.

MR. ROBERTSON: You always have got to have some kind of a pattern. They have to fit in if we are going to call it a series.

MR. McLEOD: That's right.

MR. ROBERTSON: It has to be a series to some extent.

MR. PEETS: That seems to be a very important point as to whether you are going to get this thing done in a series of sixes as a unit or whether the unit is to be one stamp. I think that if you are going to have each or a majority of the people submitting groups of sixes as a consecutive group like chapters in a book to be correlated to make a final sequence, then everything will cost more. People will have to do much more work.

MR. ROBERTSON: That is not what I meant.

MR. HALL: It is optional.

MR. PEETS: I suppose you meant that each one would, each person or typically a person who submits one, and then you would pick out the best six out of those ones?

MR. HALL: Pick out the best one of the six, of a certain theme.

MR. PEETS: Then I think that is going to force people into doing their work in terms of sixes and it is an awful job to do six drawings.

MR. BIDDLE: Peets is right there. With this, especially these twenty men that are not offered anything, a great many of them will only want to hand in one or two designs. There is no objection to that, is there?

MR. HALL: I don't see any.

MR. ROBERTSON: No.

MR. PEETS: They would not be handicapped?

MR. HALL: Hand in one or six.

MR. ROBERTSON: Or more.

MR. HALL: If they want to.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I wouldn't think this is a series of six stamps but merely that you will buy six designs from the many that may be submitted.

MR. HALL: When you stop to think that some of this series will have portraits; others will have scenes of the United States and national parks, then you go into these categories mentioned by Mr. Fellers and they will be interwoven in the series. The six themes stamps will not be together in the issue. They will be scattered throughout.

MR. PEETS: Very much. That should be made clear.

MR. HALL: Maybe four, twelve, maybe eighteen cents.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Or a three-cent stamp of George Washington.

MR. HALL: That will be down in the portrait class because it is popular.

MR. PEETS: That is what I hope will be your definition but it should be made clear to the artists that they are doing individual drawings, not groups of six.

MR. HALL: That position should be made clear.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: If you don't find six good designs you only buy five or four or three. You don't expect to buy more than six.

MR. HALL: You have to get that very definitely in the specifications; they can submit a design for each theme or each category or more than one for each category but only one will be selected for each category.

MR. BIDDLE: That will be all clarified by the director when he organizes the thing and you and your brothers in the Bureau--

MR. HALL: It means getting it down in print so no one will misunderstand it.

MR. BIDDLE: Sure. Then that question of subject matter could be worked in at a later moment, could it not?

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. BIDDLE: That is, whether you want to suggest it or not.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Wouldn't it be possible to say that these six possible designs that may be selected could represent themes such as--and give a certain number--not mandatory, but throw them out as suggestions, or other themes which might be suggested by the artists.

MR. HALL: Maybe you don't want to place a limitation on it to just those six ideas. Maybe they would want to go farther than that.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: You would get more originality in that way.

MR. NEILD: Rather than tell them that landscapes or the presidents' portraits will be accepted, why don't we give them other material? There have been so many of those done. Let's say: One World, or Four Freedoms.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: This is no competition for portraits or landscapes.

MR. NEILD: I meant to exclude that.

MR. HALL: They are not in on the portraits or the landscapes.

MR. BELLUSCHI: May I be excused?

MR. ROBERTSON: May I say before you go that we have three financing problems--being an exbanker. We pay for the designs. That seems easy. Perhaps we can get somebody to conduct, to do the clerical work. Could we get some money, for instance, to induce these twenty people to participate and in general to stimulate interest?

MR. BELLUSCHI: I can try with the Rockefeller Foundation. The Ford Foundation is in a moratorium now; until they find out what they are going to do with the money, they are just not giving it away. But Rockefeller, I think if it is properly explained, and I see them quite often and I could probably find out whether--

MR. ROBERTSON: It would be fine to have a little money we do not have to account for officially.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Five or six thousand, probably. No more than that.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We will all see what we can do about that.

MR. ROBERTSON: Something we don't have to pinpoint. This would be a good boost for art.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Just what they like to give money for.

MR. ROBERTSON: And in such good hands.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Excuse me.

(Exit Mr. Belluschi)

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would you like to settle on someone as a director that could be invited by the Postmaster General? For instance, do you like the idea of Fiske Kimball?

MR. HALL: I like the idea of having somebody that is not too close to the Bureau or too close to the Post Office to handle this thing.

MR. ROBERTSON: I think by all means.

MR. NEILD: Someone who has handled competitions heretofore.

MR. HALL: Somebody with experience on this.

MR. ROBERTSON: We should have.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We suggested Mr. Kimball's name because he has done this kind of thing and I think he would do it as a public service, and if you get him into that, we would advise with him about the composition of a jury and he would talk to both of you about the mechanics of the business.

MR. HALL: I think that would be very good.

MR. BIDDLE: He has a museum staff to--

MR. ROBERTSON: He is available?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think so. He is in Philadelphia. If he is not, we will think of someone else.

MR. HALL: I think that would be very desirable because he can speak the language of the artists and he can get from us the legal limitations that we have to work under.

MR. ROBERTSON: Will you do this, Mr. Hall. You said you would like to have somebody look at that.

MR. HALL: I would like to have the legal boys go over it.

MR. ROBERTSON: Give us a memorandum, will you, of the financial aspect of it and then as long as it has been suggested that the Postmaster General--what shall we say--is he going to conduct the competition?

MR. HALL: I understood--

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think it would be best.

MR. HALL: In the name of the Postmaster General. Since it is a postage stamp, it will carry more prestige if the Postmaster General is attached to it rather than the Bureau of Engraving and Printing which most people never heard of.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: If you don't like it, you can name the Commission of Fine Arts.

MR. ROBERTSON: We shall want to give the Postmaster General an outline of just what the setup is.

MR. HALL: Oh, yes. Of course, the actual purchasing to be made by the Bureau and included in the bill with the cost of production of stamps.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: You should invite the director to serve and the members of the jury to serve.

MR. ROBERTSON: The Postmaster General should?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Yes, because they will be outstanding people, and they are not being paid for their service on the jury. If the jury has to do any traveling we will need a little money to pay that.

MR. ROBERTSON: We ought to have a little spending money.

MR. HALL: I don't know how we can get that.

MR. ROBERTSON: I think we can see what we can do from some patron.

MR. BIDDLE: Is it that the first purchase would be $1,000 or $500?

MR. ROBERTSON: I wouldn't think so. I think we would buy six designs all on a parity.

MR. BIDDLE: At how much each.

MR. ROBERTSON: I don't know about the figure. That is something else.

MR. HALL: I said we paid $500 for one in 1937.

MR. ROBERTSON: What, in your opinion, would be a fair price for us to pay?

MR. HALL: I would say one thousand dollars.

MR. BIDDLE: That would be wonderful because it makes an enormous difference in getting the support of good artists if you can have as much as that.

MR. HALL: I think it can be done. Of course, I would like to let the legal boys look into it and the General Accounting Office.

MR. BIDDLE: It will make an incredible difference in the results if you are as generous as that.

MR. HALL: I am just basing my opinion on the value of a dollar in 1937 as compared to today. Anything you paid $500 for you will pay $1,000 today.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: You have to check with the General Accounting Office on this?

MR. HALL: On the procedure, not on the dollar. We want to make certain that we are not in conflict with any law which they know about that perhaps we do not know about.

MR. ROBERTSON: As I see it, the Post Office is interested in getting some good stamps, to buy them.

Where do we get them? The Art Commission and others suggest we try it this way. That is about the story. We are actually purchasers of designs. The rest of it is incidental to getting those designs available.

Is that right?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: That's right. Like putting out something for bids. Only you are going to get bids of designs from these artists.

MR. ROBERTSON: Can you work up a memorandum on this for us so we can ask the Postmaster General to okay it? This is taking a little different turn from our last conversation when we were talking about the Bureau conducting the competition.

MR. HALL: Yes, we were.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Do you want anything from us for the Postmaster General?

MR. ROBERTSON: What would it be?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I don't see that you need it. We suggested the name of Mr. Kimball and then after consulting with him, we will suggest the name of a jury. In fact, you could write a letter, if you like, explaining or asking, will you suggest the name of someone to direct the competition.

MR. ROBERTSON: We could do that. We will have the approval of the Postmaster General to do it.

MR. NEILD: The jury should include someone from the Post Office Department and someone from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: One man from each place.

MR. ROBERTSON: Just to be safe on the technical side.

MR. HALL: That is where we went astray in 1937. The design submitted was for lithographic printing, not for line engraving. We have not been satisfied with that issue. We have tried to imitate mass printing, lithographic printing, by line. It does not do a good job.

MR. McLEOD: Doesn't the Interior Department invite the Bureau to judge some of their designs for this--migratory birds--that they submitted last year?

MR. HALL: Yes. I was judge last year.

MR. McLEOD: They put out a competition on birds and animals and things like that. Every year they put out on a competitive basis for designs on these migratory birds and all the artists compete in that and one year I was a judge and Mr. Hall has been a judge on that same thing. They submit some wonderful drawings but the thing is it affects our type of work, the technique in which they make them, and that is as we like it in this so-called India ink.

MR. BIDDLE: Really for engraving.

MR. McLEOD: Yes, sir.

MR. BIDDLE: So you are not dependent--

MR. McLEOD: If they could see some of the drawings in our division--

MR. HALL: I wish they could go over there and see some of our work.

MR. ROBERTSON: Would they have a moment to do that before we adjourn?

MR. McLEOD: You could see some of the problems.

MR. HALL: We will be operating for a half hour. I think it would be a good idea if you took a trip to our Engraving Division and saw some of the work that was done.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We were saying, I would like to include among the 20 invitees some really good American Indian artists because they are very good at giving you sharp outline and using symbolism. I think we might get something there.

MR. BIDDLE: It would be a wonderful theme.

MR. ROBERTSON: I was at the show Sunday night.

MR. BIDDLE: Wonderful for European stamps.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Have you ever had an Indian artist do a design?

MR. HALL: No.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I will invite you to come over to the exhibition of Indian water colors now at the National Gallery.

MR. ROBERTSON: It is a good show.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: They can give you a bird in very stylized form.

MR. HALL: Pop Challee?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Yes, that is the lady's name. Pop Challee. I met her onee and asked whether I should address her as Mrs. Pop Challee or Miss Pop Challee? Just, "Pop Challee," she said.

MR. ROBERTSON: There was a new one there. Do you suppose she is the daughter of Luhan?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I don't think so.

MR. ROBERTSON: Mr. Hall, Mr. Fellers and I will undertake to get this down in some sort of formal shape and to get the Postmaster General to okay, if he approves. We have got to think about the financing of it and I do hope we can get a little free. When I say, free, I mean fluid money that will help.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: How much would you think would be needed?

MR. ROBERTSON: I don't know. I suppose we ought to figure up some kind of a little budget.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Why don't you do that and let us know.

MR. ROBERTSON: The kind of a budget we might need.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Why don't you write us a letter and say, "we would like you to suggest a director and with him to suggest a jury and we would need outside of the Government funds available some free money to be contributed up to the sum of so much."

MR. ROBERTSON: Does that meet with your approval?

MR. HALL: Good.

MR. ROBERTSON: I am hoping something good comes out of this.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think we might get something very good especially if you invite my Indian friends.

MR. HALL: I hope we get the Post Office Department off the spot. There has been a lot of criticism of design and it is time that we--

MR. ROBERTSON: That does not necessarily bother us.

MR. HALL: It is not a healthy thing, to have criticism all the time. Maybe it is a healthy thing because when they criticize enough you do something about it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It will be fine for the artists too if they respond well.

MR. HALL: That is the feeling I have. Your commission is in a position to say yes or no to this thing. Either we are right or we are wrong. We want to find out.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We do want to help.

MR. BIDDLE: I think that Aline Loucheim who wrote those articles in the New York Times will be terribly interested in this whole idea of competition and will give it a lot of space.

(Whereupon, at 3:40 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)

x x x

C O P Y

TREASURY DEPARTMENT
BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING
Washington 25, D. C.

November 24, 1953

Dear Mr. Caemmerer:

Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to edit the transcript of discussion concerning the new postage stamps which took place in my office November 17. I have made a few changes.

Our boys are busily engaged in going into the matter and we hope to have something crystallized within the next few weeks.

Sincerely yours,
Sgd.
A. W. Hall
Director

Mr. H. P. Caemmerer
Secretary, The Commission of Fine Arts
Room 7000, South Interior Department Building
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT G-2

Index to Minutes of Meeting
The Commission of Fine Arts
17 December 1953

American Battle Monuments Commission
Model for memorial in Military Cemetery at Manila 11

American Federation of Labor
Headquarters Building 7

Commission of Fine Arts
Public Relations (See Exhibit M) 4

Foreign Service Buildings
Architectural features of 9

Fort Drive
Change in name of 2

General Accounting Office
Inspection of mural painting by Mitchell Jamison 10

Howard University
Pre-Medical Clinic Building 4

Kenilworth and Deane Avenues
Overpass 7

Marine Corps War Memorial
Relief model for 1

Old Georgetown Board of Architectural Consultants
Resignation of Wm. Dewey Foster 7
Appoint of Walter G. Peter, jr. 7

Postage Stamp Design Competition 6

Public Law 808- Old Georgetown Act
Submission #747 for razing residences at 3614-16-18-20 O Street, N.W. 7

Public Relations
See Commission of Fine Arts above

Jun 15, 2017